



# ADS Chapter 201

## Planning

Partial Revision Date: 03/23/2012  
Responsible Office: PPL  
File Name: 201\_032312

**Functional Series 200 – Programming Policy**  
**ADS 201 – Planning**

**Table of Contents**

<b><u>201.1</u></b>	<b><u>OVERVIEW</u></b> .....	<b><u>4</u></b>
<b><u>201.2</u></b>	<b><u>PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES</u></b> .....	<b><u>4</u></b>
<b><u>201.3</u></b>	<b><u>POLICY DIRECTIVES AND REQUIRED PROCEDURES</u></b> ....	<b><u>4</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.1</u></b>	<b><u>Mandatory and Non-Mandatory Guidance</u></b> .....	<b><u>4</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.2</u></b>	<b><u>Strategic Planning</u></b> .....	<b><u>5</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.2.1</u></b>	<b><u>USAID Country Development Cooperation Strategy (CDCS)</u></b> .....	<b><u>5</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.2.2</u></b>	<b><u>Multi-Year Planning Requirements</u></b> .....	<b><u>7</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.3</u></b>	<b><u>USAID Country Development Cooperation Strategy Content</u></b> .....	<b><u>7</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.3.1</u></b>	<b><u>Development Context, Challenges and Opportunities</u></b> .....	<b><u>8</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.3.2</u></b>	<b><u>Development Hypothesis</u></b> .....	<b><u>9</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.3.3</u></b>	<b><u>Results Framework</u></b> .....	<b><u>9</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.3.4</u></b>	<b><u>Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning</u></b> .....	<b><u>16</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.3.5</u></b>	<b><u>Program Resources and Priorities</u></b> .....	<b><u>17</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.3.6</u></b>	<b><u>Management Requirements</u></b> .....	<b><u>18</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.4</u></b>	<b><u>CDCS Process</u></b> .....	<b><u>19</u></b>
<b><u>*201.3.4.1</u></b>	<b><u>Phase 1 – Initial Consultations</u></b> .....	<b><u>19</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.4.2</u></b>	<b><u>Phase 2 – Results Framework Development</u></b> .....	<b><u>23</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.4.3</u></b>	<b><u>Phase 3 - Full CDCS Preparation, Review, and Approval</u></b> .....	<b><u>26</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.5</u></b>	<b><u>Performance Management Plan (PMP)</u></b> .....	<b><u>27</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.6</u></b>	<b><u>Estimate of Required Resources</u></b> .....	<b><u>28</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.7</u></b>	<b><u>Projects</u></b> .....	<b><u>29</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.7.1</u></b>	<b><u>Projects and their Role within the Program Cycle</u></b> .....	<b><u>30</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.7.2</u></b>	<b><u>Country Development Cooperation Strategy to Project Design</u></b> .....	<b><u>30</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.8</u></b>	<b><u>Project Design</u></b> .....	<b><u>30</u></b>

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

<u>201.3.8.1</u>	<u>Transition During 2012-2013 .....</u>	<u>30</u>
<u>201.3.8.2</u>	<u>Project Design Schedule.....</u>	<u>31</u>
<u>201.3.8.3</u>	<u>Concept Paper Peer Review.....</u>	<u>32</u>
<u>201.3.8.4</u>	<u>Project vs. Activity Approval Document (AAD).....</u>	<u>32</u>
<u>201.3.8.5</u>	<u>Additional Principles of Project Design .....</u>	<u>32</u>
<b><u>201.3.9</u></b>	<b><u>The Project Design Process .....</u></b>	<b><u>34</u></b>
<u>201.3.9.1</u>	<u>Stage 1: Concept Stage.....</u>	<u>35</u>
<u>201.3.9.2</u>	<u>Stage 1: Result - Concept Paper .....</u>	<u>37</u>
<b><u>*201.3.9.3</u></b>	<b><u>Stage 2: Analytical Stage.....</u></b>	<b><u>41</u></b>
<u>201.3.9.4</u>	<u>Stage 2: Result - Project Appraisal Document (PAD) .....</u>	<u>49</u>
<u>201.3.9.5</u>	<u>Stage 3: Project Authorization (estimated 3 pages).....</u>	<u>56</u>
<u>201.3.9.6</u>	<u>Stage 3: Result - Project Authorization to Implementation.....</u>	<u>58</u>
<b><u>201.3.10</u></b>	<b><u>Sub-Obligations .....</u></b>	<b><u>59</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.11</u></b>	<b><u>Pre-Obligation Requirements .....</u></b>	<b><u>60</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.12</u></b>	<b><u>Country Prohibitions and Restrictions .....</u></b>	<b><u>65</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.13</u></b>	<b><u>Use of Checklists and Clearance Sheets.....</u></b>	<b><u>67</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.14</u></b>	<b><u>Public Access to Planning Documents.....</u></b>	<b><u>67</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.15</u></b>	<b><u>Principles Governing Release of Information .....</u></b>	<b><u>67</u></b>
<b><u>201.3.16</u></b>	<b><u>Guidelines for Managing Access to Information .....</u></b>	<b><u>69</u></b>
<b><u>201.4</u></b>	<b><u>MANDATORY REFERENCES .....</u></b>	<b><u>69</u></b>
<b><u>201.4.1</u></b>	<b><u>External Mandatory References .....</u></b>	<b><u>69</u></b>
<b><u>201.4.2</u></b>	<b><u>Internal Mandatory References .....</u></b>	<b><u>70</u></b>
<b><u>201.5</u></b>	<b><u>ADDITIONAL HELP .....</u></b>	<b><u>73</u></b>
<b><u>201.6</u></b>	<b><u>DEFINITIONS.....</u></b>	<b><u>73</u></b>

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

## **ADS 201 – Planning**

### **201.1 OVERVIEW**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

In line with USAID Forward reforms and a renewed focus on the core components of the Program Cycle, the Agency has developed several key guidance and policy pieces in the last year that are incorporated into the ADS 200 series with this update.

This chapter covers Strategic and Project Planning. All components of this chapter are either drawn from approved policies and guidance (the USAID Policy Framework, the Program Cycle Overview, the CDCS Guidance, and the Project Design Guidance) or is remaining text from last revision of this chapter.

### **201.2 PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES**

Effective date: 09/01/2008

USAID organizations with primary responsibilities for aspects of planning include:

- USAID Missions and their Development Objective (DO) Teams
- Regional Bureaus
- Regional Platforms
- Pillar Bureaus
- The Bureau for Management (M)
- The Office of the Chief Operating Officer (COO)
- The Bureau for Foreign Assistance (FA)
- The Office of the General Counsel (GC) and its Regional Legal Advisors (RLA)
- The Office of Development Partners (ODP)
- The Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives (CFBCI)
- The Office of Security (SEC)

For detailed descriptions of responsibilities, please see [ADS 200.2](#).

### **201.3 POLICY DIRECTIVES AND REQUIRED PROCEDURES**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

#### **201.3.1 Mandatory and Non-Mandatory Guidance**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

In line with USAID Forward reforms and a renewed focus on the core components of the Program Cycle, the Agency has developed several key guidance and policy pieces in 2011 that are incorporated into the ADS 200 series with this 02/10/2012 revision. These include the USAID Policy Framework 2011-2015, guidance for Country Development Cooperation Strategies, project design guidance, and an Evaluation Policy.

This chapter describes both mandatory and non-mandatory procedures and practices. Mandatory procedures are identified by the words —must, —required, or other clear designation.

The non-mandatory procedures described in this chapter are intended to increase consistency and predictability of operations. Non-mandatory procedures represent —best practices|| in development planning. They are identified with use of the words—should, —recommend, —may, or other clear designation. Although USAID Missions and Bureaus/Independent Offices (B/IOs) should generally follow these procedures, they may choose to deviate from them or adapt them to particular situations, especially when such deviations promote core values, Agency operating principles, and increase cost-efficiency. USAID Missions and B/IOs do not have to document deviations from non-mandatory procedures.

Note: To alert readers, the word —MANDATORY will often appear at the start of a paragraph. The paragraph itself may contain a combination of mandatory and non-mandatory language, as signaled by the words listed above.

Special Exemptions: Certain programs are exempted from the mandatory procedures described in this chapter, including (1) emergency disaster assistance under the International Disaster Assistance (IDA) account and (2) emergency food aid authorized under Title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (Public Law 480).

### **201.3.2 Strategic Planning**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

#### **201.3.2.1 USAID Country Development Cooperation Strategy (CDCS)**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

USAID's Country Development Cooperation Strategies (CDCS) continue to improve upon the Agency's long tradition of strategic planning to define development objectives

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

and maximize the impact of development cooperation. The CDCS process implements the Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review (QDDR) and the Presidential Policy Directive on Global Development (PPD-6), which states:

“USAID will work in collaboration with other agencies to formulate country development cooperation strategies that are results-oriented, and will partner with host countries to focus investment in key areas that shape countries’ overall stability and prosperity.”

A CDCS is a five-year strategy (although it may be shorter for countries in transition) that focuses on USAID-implemented assistance and related USG non-assistance tools. USAID Missions work closely with host country governments and citizens, civil society organizations, the private sector, multi-lateral organizations, other donors, the State Department, and other USG agencies to develop a CDCS that:

- Supports U.S. foreign policy priorities;
- Ensures strategic alignment with host country development priorities and promotes mutual accountability;
- Takes into account the needs, rights, and interests of the country’s citizens;
- Focuses on achieving development results that have clear and measurable impacts;
- Incorporates USAID’s Policy Framework for 2011-2015, Agency-level policies and strategies, Presidential Initiatives, and USAID Forward;
- Communicates Mission needs, constraints, and opportunities;
- Defines a Goal, Development Objectives, Intermediate Results, and Performance Indicators through a Results Framework and supporting narrative;
- Defines associated resource priorities;
- Serves as the basis for the annual Mission Strategic Resource Plan, Congressional Budget Justification, and other assistance planning, budgeting, and reporting processes; and

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

- Links policies and strategies to project design and implementation, monitoring and evaluation, learning, and resources.

### **201.3.2.2 Multi-Year Planning Requirements**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

All bilateral missions and regional platforms are required to develop a CDCS by the end of FY 2013, with the exception of those that are:

- (1) Implementing a single sector program, such as health;
- (2) Phasing-down or closing the Mission by FY 2014; and
- (3) Special-purpose Missions such as those in non-presence countries.

The Bureau of Policy, Planning, and Learning (PPL) and regional and technical bureaus are prepared to support Missions to meet this requirement with short and long-term TDYs. PPL also is collecting and posting resource materials such as:

- Approved CDCS;
- Results Frameworks;
- Local stakeholder outreach models;
- Best practices to incorporate gender equality;
- Assessment tools; and
- Learning approaches See [ProgramNet](#)

PPL will work with Regional Bureaus to adapt the CDCS Guidance where necessary for fragile states, countries in transition, and regional platforms.

### **201.3.3 USAID Country Development Cooperation Strategy Content**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

Structure: The Country Development Cooperation Strategy Content (CDCS) should be between 30 and 50 pages not including annexes, although the most important

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

consideration is to be clear and concise. The CDCS must include the following key sections (executive summary optional):

- Development Context, Challenges and Opportunities;
- Development Hypothesis;
- The Results Framework – CDCS Goal, Development Objectives, Intermediate Results, sub-Intermediate Results, and Performance Indicators;
- Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning;
- Program Resources and Priorities; and
- Management Requirements.

#### **201.3.3.1 Development Context, Challenges and Opportunities**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

This section describes the development context and overarching U.S. foreign policy and national security considerations. It explains the most important development challenges and opportunities facing the host country and identifies those areas that the Mission proposes to address. The challenges and opportunities described should be based on evidence and analysis drawn from relevant studies and data such as:

- The country's poverty reduction strategy;
- World Bank and International Monetary Fund assessments;
- Geospatial analysis; and
- Research, evaluations, and analysis commissioned by USAID, including the mandatory gender analysis, other USG agencies, other donors, the private sector, and independent policy research organizations.

This section should cite economic, social, political, governance, and demographic indices, and identify important national and regional trends in security, economic development, political dynamics and special circumstances related to state fragility, conflict, or post-conflict transitions.

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*



**201.3.3.2 Development Hypothesis**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

The CDCS is based upon a sound development hypothesis that describes the theory of change, logic, and causal relationships between the building blocks needed to achieve a long-term goal. The development hypothesis

- Is based on development theory, practice, literature, and experience;
- Is country-specific; and
- Explains why and how the proposed investments from USAID and others collectively lead to achieving the Development Objectives (DOs) and ultimately the CDCS Goal.

It is a short narrative that explains the relationships between each layer of results (see **201.3.3.3**), upwards from the sub-Intermediate Results (sub-IRs), to the IRs, the DOs, and the CDCS Goal, often through if-then statements that reference the evidence that supports the causal linkages. The development hypothesis components should be examined and evaluated to assess, learn, and adapt after CDCS approval.

**201.3.3.3 Results Framework**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

The Results Framework (RF) is a graphical representation of the development hypothesis and includes the CDCS Goal, Development Objectives (DOs), Intermediate Results (IR), sub-IRs, and performance indicators.

The RF should be presented based on the design format below and be supported by accompanying narrative that addresses how USAID, working closely with host country government and citizens, civil society, the private sector, multi-lateral organizations, the State Department, and other USG agencies can best address the specific development challenges and opportunities identified by the Mission, based on evidence, to achieve its DOs and CDCS Goal.

**(a) CDCS Goal:** The CDCS Goal is the highest-level impact to be advanced or achieved by USAID, the host country, civil society actors, and other development partners within the CDCS timeframe. The Mission is responsible for progressing toward the CDCS Goal as it advances toward achieving the DOs. The CDCS Goal should strike a balance between being ambitious and realistic. For CDCS Goals that

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

require more than five years, indicators must demonstrate progress made to advance the CDCS Goal within the CDCS timeframe.

The CDCS Goal must reflect the cumulative impact of the DOs and capture the RF's internal logic: if the DOs are accomplished or advanced, progress will be made toward achieving the CDCS Goal. The CDCS should specify any other critical elements, in addition to the DOs, that are necessary to achieve the CDCS Goal such as:

- Host country commitments,
- Results from other donors, and
- Factors outside of USAID's control.

The CDCS Goal and associated DOs should show progress toward project sustainability and a reduction of future USAID support as appropriate. There should be clear causal linkages with little or no redundancy between the CDCS Goal and DOs.

The CDCS Goal is expected to reflect the unique development challenges and opportunities of the country or region. The roles of USAID and its partners in helping to achieve the CDCS Goal must be described in the RF narrative, including the specific contributions of the host country government, civil society, the private sector, State Department, other USG agencies, and other donors as appropriate. Indicators are required to demonstrate that the CDCS Goal (or progress toward the CDCS Goal) is measurable and achievable.

**(b) Development Objectives (DOs) and Intermediate Results (IR):** A DO is the most ambitious result that a Mission, together with its development partners, can materially affect, and for which USAID will be held accountable to demonstrate impact. The IR is the set of results that together are sufficient to achieve the DOs. The IR should be the starting point for designing a "project," but the Mission may determine that a project should be a DO or sub-IR based on the country context and nature of the RF.

The CDCS should have no more than four DOs. Missions should design DOs based on evidence that illustrates why an investment of USAID resources will result in targeted, priority development outcomes. The DOs should be based on the strategic priorities defined by the Mission, not solely on the size of the supporting assistance programs. For example, democratic governance could be a critical issue and

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

therefore a DO, though the resources available for programming in this area may be relatively limited.

The typical time horizon for achieving the DO and IR should be five years, coinciding with the lifetime of the CDCS. Supporting each DO should be a number of priority IRs and sub-IRs that describe the results necessary to achieve the intended outcomes at the IR or DO levels. In developing the DOs, with supporting IRs, Missions are required to address and provide evidence to answer the following questions as part of the RF narrative:

- How does the DO contribute to the CDCS Goal? What are the plausible causal linkages?
- Is the DO based on a clear development hypothesis and strong evidence, including from evaluations conducted by the Mission?
- What is the intended impact of the DO? What magnitude of change is anticipated over the life of the CDCS?
- Does the DO address identified sources of conflict, fragility, instability or vulnerability?
- How does the DO focus USAID resources?
- Does the DO reflect USAID's comparative advantage in the country and a division of labor with other development partners, including the private sector?
- Does the DO take into account the political, economic, and social dynamics that influence development outcomes and impacts in the country or region?
- What is the role of the host country government, civil society, and private sector, and others to help achieve the DO?
- What USG diplomatic efforts or other interagency support are needed to achieve the DO?

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

- Does the DO reduce gaps between the status of males and females, enhance the leadership and expertise of women and girls, and meet their needs?
- Does the DO consider the particular issues associated with youth, minority groups, persons with disabilities, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender communities?

**(1) Types of DOs and IRs:** The DOs and IRs may be mutually reinforcing and should not solely reflect functional objectives as defined by the Office of the Director of Foreign Assistance's (F) Standardized Program Structure. DOs and IRs may be multi-sector or sector-based:

- **Multi-sector:** Integrates technical approaches, principles, and resources from various sectors and sources to achieve a common objective such as community-based stabilization, youth development and empowerment, improved economic governance or effective social service delivery. Such DOs and IRs lead to outcomes and impacts that result from integrating democratic governance, economic growth, natural resource management, health, education, agriculture, conflict resolution, and other possible sector-based or sub-sector technical approaches and principles into a unified programmatic approach. DOs and IRs should attempt to integrate issues such as gender equality/women's empowerment, youth, and capacity building.
- **Sector-based:** Focuses on areas such as health, education, agriculture, democracy and governance, and economic growth. This may be an effective approach to align the CDCS Goal and DOs with host country or local stakeholder priorities, build on past success, bring programs to scale, or structure a Mission implementing multiple sector-based initiatives. Although focused on a particular sector, sector-based DOs and IRs should build synergies with other DOs and IRs to the maximum extent possible.

**(2) Non-USAID Resources:** For each DO, the CDCS should include assumptions about the results achieved through non-USAID resources, including other USG agencies, the host country government, other donors, multilateral development institutions, non-governmental organizations, and private sector organizations. This description should outline how efforts

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

are coordinated to create a division of labor among development actors. The Mission also may wish to reflect these roles graphically in the RF itself, if deemed useful.

**(3) Special/Support Objectives:** Missions should not propose Special Objectives unless the Mission has a compelling reason why a DO is not appropriate to address the particular issue. Regional Platforms may include a Support Objective for services provision, if appropriate.

**(4) Focus and Selectivity:** As outlined in the USAID Policy Framework for 2011-2015 and the PPD-6, USAID must be selective about where it invests its resources to maximize the Agency's long-term impact. USAID should focus its' invested resources to ensure they are large enough to have a meaningful, measurable, and lasting impact. In developing the CDCS, the Mission is required to focus strategically to maximize the impact of USAID resources in partnership with various stakeholders. The CDCS must address each of the following means of targeting and prioritizing USAID interventions, highlighting any trade-offs:

:

- **Division of Labor:** The Mission should leverage other development actors' resources and non-assistance tools, including those of host country governments and citizens, civil society organizations, the private sector, multi-lateral organizations, other donors, the State Department, and other USG agencies so that USAID can maximize the impact of its assistance, better focus in areas where it has a comparative advantage, rationalize resource allocations, and bring successful programs to scale. For example, a Mission may propose to concentrate on primary reading skills improvement and expand the scope of its interventions, while another development actor provides capacity-building support, while both work with the Ministry of Education and Teachers' Associations.
- **Geographically:** The Mission should determine whether interventions can be more effectively advanced by focusing resources geographically. Resources could be from within a specific sector or across sectors for a more integrated approach. Specific populations and beneficiaries within regions, such as economically vulnerable households or particular communities, also should be considered.

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

- (5) Sector and Sub-sector:** The Mission should determine which sectors (e.g., health, agriculture, education, governance) are its highest priority and important to advancing the CDCS Goal. Lower priority sectors and related interventions should be reduced or phased-out, while support for higher priority sectors should be strengthened. Sector-based DOs and IRs should build synergies with other DOs and IRs whenever possible, leading to greater impact.
- (6) Institutionally:** The Mission should build the capacity of specific institutions and related governance systems at the state (national), regional (sub-national), or local levels – or a combination of these – to achieve sustainable results. For example, the Mission may conclude through its analysis that the key obstacle to inclusive economic growth is non-transparent and inefficient financial management systems, and determine to work with the Ministry of Economy and Finance to improve its capacity for sound financial management at the national level, while working simultaneously with municipal governments to ensure equitable resource allocations and an independent anti-corruption commission.
- (7) Small Projects:** The Mission should consider whether small-scale interventions, generally relating to an IR, have a measurable outcome and are cost effective. While Missions are encouraged to eliminate small-scale interventions with marginal outcome, the Agency recognizes that relatively small levels of well-targeted funding can help achieve important outcomes, including working with local partners and supporting larger initiatives.
- (8) Agency-Wide Policies and Strategies:** In developing a CDCS, Missions should consider and reflect, as appropriate, the USAID Policy Framework for 2011-2015 and Agency-wide policies and strategies that are formulated by Policy Tasks Teams (PTT) and approved by Agency leadership and the Administrator. (A list of current and future policies and strategies can be found at <http://inside.usaid.gov/PPL/offices/p/psptt.cfm>). Policies and strategies should be incorporated or reflected within the various RF levels (the CDCS Goal, DOs, IRs and sub-IRs). Relevant analysis and evidence contained in policies and strategies may be cited to help support the CDCS analytical sections and may help to frame the development hypothesis. The Administrator's Policy Directive on Agency-Wide Policy and Strategy Implementation (posted at:

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

<http://inside.usaid.gov/PPL/offices/p/psptt.cfm>) outlines the policy and strategy alignment and exceptions processes.

- (9) USAID Forward:** In developing a RF and supporting narrative, the Mission should demonstrate how it is integrating USAID Forward, including working through host country systems, developing the capacity of civil society and private sector partners, and advancing the use of science technology, and innovation.
- (10) Integrating Presidential Initiatives:** The CDCS integrates individual country-based Presidential Initiative plans and strategies to ensure that these investments promote sustainable development outcomes by incorporating appropriate democratic governance and economic growth interventions and following the same logic as the over-arching CDCS. Missions have the flexibility to reflect country-team developed plans for the Global Health Initiative (GHI), Feed the Future (FTF), and Global Climate Change (GCC) at the CDCS Goal, DO, or IR levels. Initiative indicators that support Initiative-specific RFs should be included in the CDCS.
- (11) Critical Assumptions and Risks:** For each DO, the CDCS must explain relevant critical assumptions and “game changing” scenarios and assess risks associated with its successful achievement. A risk factor or critical assumption lies beyond USAID’s control. For example, “Large-scale ethnic conflict surpassing the international community’s current capacity to manage or contain the conflict” would be a risk factor. For each risk factor, the CDCS assess the degree to which the country team can identify and control critical risks. The CDCS also explain how the identified assumptions and risks will be assessed periodically.
- (c) Performance Indicators:** The RF includes at least one, but generally no more than three, performance indicators for the CDCS Goal and each DO, IR, and sub-IR. As a group, the indicators should capture the intended impact of the CDCS and how this impact will be achieved. Baseline values for these indicators should be included if available. These indicators are an important means to measure and evaluate the impact of the CDCS and progress toward achieving the results.

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

**201.3.3.4 Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

**(a) Monitoring:** Missions are required to monitor progress toward achieving or advancing the CDCS Goal, DOs, IRs, and sub-IRs based on the Performance Indicators included in the CDCS. These Performance Indicators will be further developed and refined, along with baselines and targets, in the Mission's Performance Management Plan, developed subsequent to CDCS.

**(b) Evaluation:** Missions are required to include the following evaluation components, which are reflected in the Agency's Evaluation Policy, found at <http://www.usaid.gov/evaluation>:

:

- Identification of high priority evaluation questions for each DO that can address: (a) the development hypotheses and key assumptions underlying the programs; (b) estimating program impact; (c) policy approach in a specific sector, and/or; (d) the efficiency of the USAID implementation approach (with attention to program costs).
- At least one opportunity for impact evaluation of a project or project component within each DO. Not every opportunity identified is expected to be evaluated, but the CDCS process provides a chance for Mission leadership and technical officers to consider impact evaluation opportunities that could be operationalized, if feasible, during project design stages.

**(c) Learning:** As outlined in [ADS 200](#), learning is a core function driving the entire Program Cycle, and links together strategic and project planning ([ADS 201](#)), implementation (See [ADS 202](#)) and Evaluation and Monitoring ( See [ADS 203](#)). Missions are encouraged to develop a plan that will permit the effective integration of all components of the Cycle, so as to improve impact. The plan should be designed to improve coordination and collaboration with development partners, test promising new approaches, build on what works and eliminate what does not during CDCS implementation. This approach should also provide an analytic link between the CDCS Goal, DOs, and IRs and its supporting programs and projects, and ensure that the Mission plans, over the course of the CDCS period, to address any gaps that may exist in the evidence that underlies the DOs and development hypothesis. Learning provides for an iterative review of external changes and lessons learned from CDCS implementation.

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*



The approach should ensure that progress toward development objectives is guided by continuous learning, ongoing assessment of the causal pathway, and iterative adaptation of program implementation and, where relevant, the strategy. Learning approaches in terms of the CDCS should provide for:

- Facilitating coordination, collaboration, and exchange of experiential knowledge internally and with external stakeholders;
- Testing development hypotheses, filling critical knowledge gaps, and addressing uncertainties in the hypotheses with new research or syntheses of existing analyses;
- Ensuring new learning, innovations, and performance information, gained through monitoring and evaluation, inform strategy implementation; and
- Identifying and monitoring game changers – the broad conditions that are beyond the Mission’s control but could evolve to impede strategy implementation – based on associated tripwires that may trigger programmatic and project contingencies or even changes in strategic direction.

One approach to consider is the Collaborating, Learning, and Adapting (CLA) model, developed by USAID/Uganda and now being adopted by several other CDCS Missions.

### **201.3.3.5 Program Resources and Priorities**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

The CDCS, including the relationship of planned resources to expected results, informs overall assistance planning and resource allocation. During the CDCS Review and Approval process, proposed resource allocations will be reviewed by the Regional Bureau, which will work with PPL, BRM, F, Pillar Bureaus, and other appropriate offices to provide feedback to the Regional Bureau concerning the alignment of budget resources to the proposed strategy.

The Administrator’s annual budget recommendations to the Secretary and Deputy Secretary are informed by the approved CDCS including required resources to the maximum extent possible.

The CDCS accounts for all projected program resources for fiscal years covered by the period of the CDCS that USAID plans to implement. Resources must be allocated by

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

DO and cross-walked to the Foreign Assistance Framework (program element for Health and Education) as defined in F's Standard Program Structure. Missions must complete the resource template, [Appendix 1](#).

**Scenarios:** Given the role of the CDCS process in Agency resource allocations as well as the uncertain fiscal environment over the next several years, Missions are asked to consider two CDCS planning scenarios. These scenarios encompass a strategic planning range of programmatic responses that demonstrate the sensitivity of strategy and results to additional (or reduced) resources and are not intended to represent Administration or Agency policy guidance.

Specific resource guidance will be provided to Missions as they launch their CDCS process.

### **201.3.3.6 Management Requirements**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

The CDCS includes a brief description of the required management resources for each of the program resource level scenarios. This description should include:

- Anticipated overall Operating Expense (OE) requirements, keeping in mind that the OE of the current year will implement the program levels (pipeline) of the prior two years;
- Anticipated overall program-funded operational costs (PFOC) requirements, which would be included in the total program levels; and
- Anticipated staffing requirements over the life of the CDCS, including U.S. Direct Hire by backstop, as well as Personal Service Contractors and Foreign Service Nationals needed to implement the DO supporting programs.

The Agency will use the CDCS to help realign the workforce to support emerging priorities and initiatives, so Missions should consider their staffing needs carefully as they propose broadening or narrowing programs. Specific issues regarding the match between the staff skill set and the programmatic priorities should be noted. Particular focus should be placed on OE and staffing requirements that would be a change from current Mission OE requirements, including space, and the current Mission staffing pattern of total positions (both filled and vacant). The operational resources requested in

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

the CDCS should link to the data collected through USAID's Budget Formulation and Execution Manager (BFEM) as part of the annual operational budget submission.

Missions should keep in mind that overall Agency OE resources and staffing levels are unlikely to continue to grow as they have in recent years. Missions should consult with the M Bureau and OHR on workforce, space, ICASS, and other management issues as they prepare the CDCS. During Phase 1 of the CDCS development process, customized OE and staffing guidance for particular countries, such as those slated for graduation from development assistance, may be discussed.

#### **201.3.4 CDCS Process**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

There are three phases to the CDCS process that involve an iterative dialogue between Missions and Washington and include key check-in points:

- (1) Initial Consultations;
- (2) Results Framework Development; and
- (3) Full CDCS Preparation, Review, and Approval.

Once approved, the CDCS becomes the basis for project design, the Performance Management Plan, and evaluation, and serves as a tool for the Agency to weigh the relative impact of different levels of investments in specific countries and regions.

##### **\*201.3.4.1 Phase 1 – Initial Consultations**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

This phase is estimated at two to three weeks. Marking the start of the CDCS process, Phase 1 includes a dialogue between Washington and the Mission to identify and discuss policy, strategy, and resource parameters and the types of analyses that will help Missions produce strong CDCS grounded in realistic planning assumptions. The guiding question of the Consultation Phase is: "What does the Mission need to know in order to invest its time wisely to prepare the CDCS?"

During this phase, PPL, BRM, Regional Bureaus, Pillar Bureaus, and Independent Offices will review resource and policy considerations, including Presidential Initiatives, USAID Forward, and Congressional directives and interests to decide whether and what additional country (or region) specific resource guidance may be warranted. The Bureau

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

for Management (M) and Office of Human Resources (OHR) also may issue Mission-specific guidance on operational and staffing requirements.

The primary event during this phase is a digital video conference (DVC) co-chaired by the Mission Director and Regional Bureau AA or DAA that includes PPL and BRM as well as technical bureaus. The Mission makes a presentation that includes the following key elements:

- Overarching U.S. foreign and national security policy considerations as appropriate;
- Economic, financial, social, political, governance, demographic, and security indices that characterize the development context and identify conflict potential and other vulnerabilities;
- Country development challenges, priorities, and institutional strengths and weaknesses, including a brief overview of the host country strategy such as a National Development Plan or Poverty Reduction Strategy, and its strengths;
- Significant policy or resource considerations, such as earmarks, directives, and Presidential Initiatives;
- Analyses, assessments, evaluations, and other evidence that will be used to inform the strategy process, and those that need to be initiated or completed;
- Possible opportunities to implement USAID Forward;
- Potential roles of host country partners (governmental, civil society, private sector), USG agencies, and other donors;
- A proposed timeline for completing the CDCS, including assessments; and
- Requests for guidance and/or technical assistance from Washington.

During the DVC, representatives from USAID regional platforms and Washington bureaus and offices, including Initiative owners, are invited to comment on the presentation and raise any considerations such as alignment with an Agency policy or strategy, the need for specific assessments or evaluations, or additional resource guidance.

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

The Regional Bureau AA/DAA provides feedback and guides the discussion. Interagency input and participation is encouraged as appropriate. The discussion is intended to establish a common context and timeframe for developing and reviewing the draft Results Framework Paper and full CDCS. The CDCS process timeline should vary as little as possible so that those involved in the process may plan work, travel, consultation, and procurement schedules accordingly.

**(a) Analysis:** A CDCS must be grounded in evidence and analysis. During the Initial Consultations Phase, Missions determine what research, assessments, and evaluations are needed to inform the CDCS process and what support is needed from Washington to complete this step. As required in the Automated Directives System (ADS), Missions are required to undertake gender, tropical rain forest, and bio-diversity assessments. Missions are encouraged to draw evidence from third-party assessments and/or evaluations, to complement Mission assessments, including from government sources, civil society, the private sector, and other donors. Possible analyses include:

- **Country wide:** conflict vulnerability; democracy and governance; economic constraints; political economy; institutional capacity; disaster risk; social soundness; human capital.
- **Sector-specific or sub-sector:** democracy and governance; human rights; economic growth; financial markets; education; health; rule of law; climate change; food security.
- **Demographic:** youth; vulnerable populations; marginalized populations; persons with disabilities.
- **Other:** donor engagement; aid effectiveness; private sector engagement.

**(b) Country Gender Analysis:** Gender issues are central to the achievement of strategic plans and Development Objectives (DOs) and USAID strives to promote gender equality, in which both men and women have equal opportunity to benefit from and contribute to economic, social, cultural, and political development; enjoy socially valued resources and rewards; and realize their human rights. Accordingly, USAID planning in the development of strategic plans and DOs must take into account gender roles and relationships. Gender analysis helps guide long term planning and can ensure desired results are achieved. Gender equality/female empowerment is not a separate topic to be analyzed and

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

reported on in isolation. USAID's gender integration approach requires that gender analysis be applied to the range of technical issues that are considered in the development of strategic plans, including in DOs, IRs and sub-IRs.

**(c) Environmental Analysis—Biodiversity and Tropical Forests:** This analysis is required by Sections 118(e) and 119(d) of the [Foreign Assistance Act of 1961](#), as amended, and may not be waived, modified, or eliminated.

- **Biodiversity:** All country-level long-term plans must include a summary of analyses of the following issues: (1) the actions necessary to conserve biological diversity and (2) the extent to which the actions proposed meet the needs thus identified. This summary is based on a country level biodiversity analysis undertaken by the USAID Mission or B/IO prior to beginning its long term plan. For additional information, contact the Regional Bureau Environmental Officer and the Biodiversity Team based in the Bureau for Economic Growth, Agriculture, and Trade (EGAT). Also see the Additional Help document [200saj, PPC Summary Description of FAA sections 118\(e\) and 119\(d\) Requirements for Preparing Strategic Plans](#).
- **Tropical Forests:** For country-level long-term plans in countries that have any part of their territory within the tropics, each Overview must also include (1) a summary of the actions necessary to achieve conservation and sustainable management of tropical forests and (2) the extent to which the actions proposed meet the identified needs. This summary is based on a country level biodiversity analysis undertaken by the USAID Mission prior to beginning its long-term country plan. For additional information, contact the Regional Bureau Environmental Officer and the Forestry Team based in the EGAT Bureau. Also see the Additional Help document, [200saj, PPC Summary Description of FAA sections 118\(e\) and 119\(d\) Requirements for Preparing Strategic Plans](#).

Given the interrelated character of environmental issues, USAID Missions may wish to save time and increase results by conducting the Biodiversity and Tropical Forestry Environmental Analyses required by this section as defined chapters within a broader environmental sector assessment. Such an assessment would be able to fully integrate ongoing Congressional and Administration environmental priorities, such as climate change, water, and others.

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

In all cases, these 118/119 biodiversity and tropical forest assessments will be completed prior to initiating work on developing the joint country assistance strategy or USAID country strategic plan so that their findings will appropriately inform strategic decisions and priorities.

**(d) Consultation Note:** The second deliverable of Phase I, in addition to the Mission DVC presentation, is a Consultation Note that documents the DVC discussion, including the nature of the development context, applicability of Agency strategies or policies, required assessments, resource parameters, and the CDCS timeline. The Regional Bureau records the DVC dialogue and clears the resulting Consultation Note with the Mission and PPL. The Consultation Note is distributed to the field and Washington bureaus and offices, and sets the parameters and expectations for Phase 2.

#### **201.3.4.2 Phase 2 – Results Framework Development**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

This phase is estimated at two to three months. Phase 2 involves the Mission drafting a RF Paper based on its consultations with a full range of stakeholders and the best available evidence and analysis. This phase includes key steps outlined below, many of which will continue into Phase 3 and through project design.

**(a) Conduct Analysis:** Missions are required to review, analyze, and draw evidence-based conclusions from assessments and evaluations to produce the RF and full CDCS, including an analysis of what has worked or not worked in achieving results through past programs, projects, and activities. Assessments and analyses should not be reviewed in isolation, but should contribute to the overall picture at both the country and sector levels of specific development constraints and opportunities. Based on the analyses, Missions should consider how best to address the identified development challenges and opportunities in a strategic and cost-effective manner. The analysis should answer the question: What will happen if this investment is not made for each objective and all proposed CDCS interventions? Missions should consider whether the proposed solutions should include elements of conditionality or involve sequencing with other stakeholders' interventions to leverage the impact of USAID funding.

Once completed, assessments and evaluations provide the evidence and information needed to establish a development hypothesis that describes the causal linkages between the CDCS Goal, DOs, IRs, and sub-IRs. The Mission must reference the assessments and evaluations used to reach significant

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

conclusions in its CDCS. For example, a Mission should reference its gender analysis by being explicit about the roles, relationships, and dynamics between males and females and how these affect their needs, access to resources, ability to participate and make decisions, and the power relations between them.

**(b) Consult with Partners:** As outlined in the PPD-6, USAID should pursue development through partnerships as “development built on collaboration is more likely to engender the local leadership and ownership to turn good ideas into lasting results.” Missions are required to engage in regular discussions with host country governments and citizens, civil society organizations, the private sector, multi-lateral organizations, other donors, the State Department, and other USG agencies to inform the development of the RF Paper and the full CDCS. In conducting consultations with non-governmental organizations, Missions should consult with their RLA and/GC to avoid giving anyone or organization an unfair competitive advantage.

- **Host Country Partners:** Missions should apply Aid Effectiveness principles by linking CDCS Goals and DOs/IRs to host country priorities. Host country priorities, however, are not determined exclusively by the host country government. The Mission should also consult with private sector actors, local communities, Non-Governmental Organizations, Civil Society Organizations, as well as a range of political actors and government officials at the national, regional and local levels. Furthermore, national governments should not be treated as monoliths; government actors from the executive, legislative, and judicial branches at various administrative levels should be consulted as appropriate, as well as members of the political opposition or political organizations, as appropriate. Local stakeholder consultations should be referenced in the RF Paper and full CDCS.
- **State Department and the USG Interagency:** Missions are required to work closely with the State Department and other USG interagency partners, including the Defense Department where appropriate, to develop the RF Paper and full CDCS.
- **Other Donors:** In developing a CDCS, Missions should use host country-led donor coordination structures as venues for coordination and rationalization to the extent feasible. Missions should work at the country or regional level to coordinate with other donors in order to develop a strategy that maximizes development assistance impact.

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*



**(c) Develop RF Paper:** Based on the Phase 1 outreach with partners and Phase 2 analysis, the Mission develops a short RF Paper (estimated 10 pages, much of which may be in bullets, including the RF graphical representation) that explains the proposed results to be achieved, the focus of the strategy, and the rationale for this focus based upon evidence. Specifically, the RF Paper should explain the development hypothesis that underlies the proposed CDCS Goal, DOs, and IRs, with associated performance indicators at each level. Missions have the option to include sub-IRs at this phase. The RF Paper also should include critical assumptions and/or “game changers” and identify any additional analysis that is needed. The Mission may further refine and even reshape the RF during Phase 3, based on continuing consultations and analysis, but significant effort should be spent during Phase 2 to make the RF as concrete as possible. This will facilitate CDCS review and approval. Missions are encouraged to hold a CDCS retreat or workshop at this phase to develop the RF, bringing appropriate mission staff together to consider the evidence and analysis completed, determine the development hypothesis, and flesh-out the RF and areas for cross-sectoral integration.

**(d) Review RF Paper:** The Mission submits the completed RF Paper to the Regional Bureau for review and distribution to appropriate bureaus and offices. Overall, the RF review provides an opportunity to analyze and discuss the CDCS’s key components and logic prior to the Mission drafting the full CDCS. Bureaus and offices review the RF Paper and identify any significant concerns that need to be addressed before the CDCS ultimately can be approved. Specifically, reviewers consider the feasibility of the overarching CDCS Goal and address whether it is well supported by the DOs, and whether the DOs, IRs, and sub-IRs show a causal relationship, are well-focused, and reflect Agency policies and strategies. All Bureaus are required to submit a unified and prioritized set of significant issues that reflect the bureau’s “corporate position” directly to the Regional Bureau, rather than providing individual reviewers input.

**(e) Summarize RF Issues:** Based on responses submitted by bureaus and offices, the Regional Bureau prepares and submits to the Mission a draft RF Issues Paper cleared by PPL that prioritizes and summarizes significant issues only. The Mission and Washington hold a DVC to be co-chaired by the Mission Director and Regional Bureau AA or DAA with participation from PPL, BRM, relevant Pillar Bureaus and other offices to discuss the draft RF Issues Paper, including significant issues that needed to be addressed and steps that need to be taken to finalize the Results Framework and prepare the full CDCS. Following

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

the DVC, the Regional Bureau prepares and transmits to the Mission a final RF Issues Paper (cleared by PPL) that defines the key issues, recommended solutions, and steps to finalize the RF and prepare the full CDCS.

### **201.3.4.3 Phase 3 - Full CDCS Preparation, Review, and Approval**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

This phase is estimated at two to three months. Phase 3 of the CDCS Process involves the Mission preparing a full CDCS and includes a number of key steps outlined below.

**Finalize Analysis and Consultations:** The Mission completes ongoing assessments, evaluations, and discussions with local stakeholders, the State Department, the USG Interagency, other donors, and other partners to inform the drafting of the full CDCS.

**(a) Draft Full CDCS:** The Mission drafts the full CDCS, expanding upon the RF, based on the final RF Issues Paper and any additional analysis.

**(b) Submit and Review Draft CDCS:** The Mission Director submits the draft CDCS, under Chief of Mission authority, to the USAID Regional Bureau. The Regional Bureau AA or DAA and the Mission Director then co-chair a formal CDCS Presentation Meeting, where the Mission Director presents the draft CDCS. During and following the CDCS Presentation Meeting, Bureaus and Independent Offices provide comments to the Regional Bureau characterized as: Significant (must be addressed for strategy approval); Concerns (a change that will improve the quality of the strategy); or a Clarification (a question or request for more information). All Bureaus are required to submit one Bureau-approved Issues Matrix rather than providing individual staff or office input directly to the Regional Bureau; significant issues must include a recommendation.

**(c) Finalize and Approve CDCS:** The Regional Bureau prepares and submits to the Mission (with PPL clearance) a CDCS Issues Paper that prioritizes and summarizes any outstanding significant issues and a CDCS Issues Matrix that lists all issues raised by bureaus and offices together with recommended solutions. The Mission makes any appropriate final changes and submits a final CDCS for Regional Bureau AA approval and PPL clearance. Once approved, the Regional Bureau prepares and transmits a cable that summarizes the approved CDCS as well as key issues resolved during the CDCS process for USAID staff and the Interagency.

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

**(d) Disseminate Publicly:** Within two months of CDCS approval, the Mission prepares a public version that removes all budget, procurement, and sensitive information (such information could be included in Sensitive But Unclassified sections of the CDCS or in a CDCS annex). The Regional Bureau will post the public version of the CDCS on USAID's Website. The CDCS will be provided to Congress and should be made widely available to host country partners. The Mission submits both the final internal and public versions to the Regional Bureau, PPL, and the Development Experience Clearinghouse. The public version also provides the basis for dialogue with host country partners and other stakeholders in the private sector as the Mission moves forward in project design.

### **201.3.5 Performance Management Plan (PMP)**

Effective date: 09/01/2008

In presenting a planned new DO for Mission or Bureau/Independent Office (B/IO) approval, the DO Team must include a preliminary Performance Management Plan (PMP) that proposes performance indicators for the desired DO outcome (with baseline data and periodic and final targets). If possible, performance indicators for the IRs (with baseline data and periodic and final targets) should also be included.

Performance management requires access to useful and timely information on a broad range of factors throughout the life of a DO. Without planning how and when this information will be obtained, it will be difficult or impossible, once activities start, to put systems in place to ensure adequate information flow to enable ongoing decision-making and meet annual performance reporting requirements. In developing a DO plan, the USAID Mission or B/IO must take adequate steps to plan and institutionalize a process for collecting performance information as part of everyday work. This performance information consists of the indicators that will measure progress towards the intermediate and final results; it includes the standard indicators and custom outcome indicators to be reported against in Performance Reports (PRs). Together, these are the indicators in the PMP. (See [ADS 203.3.3](#) for a detailed description of the contents and use of a PMP. ADS 203.3.3 requires that a full PMP be prepared before initiating implementation.)

There are frequently additional process indicators related to monitoring the performance of contractors and grantees. Where these indicators differ from the PMP indicators as defined above, they are not part of the PMP, but rather are part of implementation plans. Typically, such plans are reviewed by Contracting Officer Representatives

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

(CORs) and discussed during portfolio reviews, but are not reported to Washington.(Note: The term “COR” replaces “COTR”.)

### **201.3.6 Estimate of Required Resources**

Effective Date: 09/01/2008

**Overall Budget Planning.** Formal budget planning for foreign assistance begins roughly two years before funding will be needed. For State and USAID foreign assistance accounts, the budget planning process is centralized in and coordinated by State/F. An Operating Unit initiates its request for funding in the MSP. Under the leadership of the Ambassador, all the USG agencies in-country receiving foreign affairs funding jointly request initial country funding level. This information is reviewed and analyzed by Regional and Pillar Bureaus in USAID and State to ensure the best fit of country requests with expected levels, earmarks, directives, and other considerations, including past performance and administration priorities. The resulting decisions on allocation of funds are sent to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review, adjustments are made and a reclama submitted to OMB if needed. Ultimately, the budget is formalized in the President’s Budget and the Congressional Budget Justification (CBJ). Appropriations and final approval by Congress of Operating Unit allocations provide the basis for more detailed funding allocations and preparation of the following year’s Operational Plan (OP).

In the OP, the Operating Unit provides specific information on how its expected funding (from all accounts) will be allocated to achieve foreign assistance objectives. In identifying specific resource needs and requesting adjustments to control levels if necessary, USAID Missions should consider issues such as:

- Status and timeliness of input mobilization (such as receipt of new funding, negotiations for new projects, and staff deployments);
- Progress in preparing Annual Procurement Plans, including identification of specific procurement instruments that will be used;
- Pipeline levels and future resource requirements;
- Team effectiveness and adequacy of staffing;
- Opportunities to accelerate achievement of results or obtain greater impact from well-performing programs; and

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

- Funding available from sources such as public-private alliances, local currency availability from monetization programs, or cost sharing (see below).

**Costs to USAID.** In planning a new DO, the DO Team must include an estimate of the total resource requirements of the DO, disaggregated by funding source and fiscal year. All USAID resources must be included in this cost estimate, including program resources of all types, food aid, staff, and operating expenses. (See also **201.3.11.10.**)

In providing funding estimates for out-years, USAID Missions should take into account likely U.S. and host country inflation rates and the best information available of future changes in foreign exchange rates.

**Costs to Partners.** USAID policy encourages cost sharing by partners. Cost sharing requirements for host country governments are described in [ADS 350](#). Cost sharing on the part of private voluntary organizations (PVOs) and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) should be applied in a flexible way on a case-by-case basis. For more information, see [ADS 303.3.10](#).

### **201.3.7 Projects**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

A “project” is defined as:

A set of executed interventions, over an established timeline and budget intended to achieve a discrete development result through resolving an associated problem. It is explicitly linked to the CDCS Results Framework. More succinctly, a project is a collaborative undertaking with a beginning and end, designed to achieve a specific purpose.

Several other terms relate to this definition of project, including “program” and “activity” (see [ADS Glossary](#)).

“Program” is aligned with a CDCS Development Objective and includes all projects and other activities that are associated with a particular DO.

“Activity” is a component of a project that contributes to a project purpose. It refers to an award (such as a contract or cooperative agreement), or a component of a project such as policy dialog that may be undertaken directly by Mission staff.

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

**201.3.7.1 Projects and their Role within the Program Cycle**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

Project design and implementation is at the heart of the program cycle, framed by Agency policies and strategies, strategic planning, and monitoring and evaluation. All the Program Cycle components are required for a project to succeed in achieving results:

- Agency or USG-wide policies and strategies set our broad development priorities;
- Sound strategic planning tells us what development results are to be achieved and why;
- The rigorous design and implementation of a project helps us identify and realize when and how best to achieve those results in the most effective manner; and
- Rigorous evaluation provides evidence as to whether and why our effort had the intended impact, or if not, why not, and sets the stage for the next program cycle.

When designing a project, the entire cycle must always be kept in mind.

**201.3.7.2 Country Development Cooperation Strategy to Project Design**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

The project design process is a continuum of activities and analyses that begins with the development of the Country Development Cooperation Strategy (CDCS) to Project Design and concludes with the authorization of a project designed to achieve the results defined in the Results Framework (RF) of the CDCS, normally at the Intermediate Result (IR) level. In some cases, availability of resources or complexity may result in a Mission focusing a project design at the Development Objective (DO) or sub-IR level.

**201.3.8 Project Design**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

**201.3.8.1 Transition During 2012-2013**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

**ADS 201.3.8** applies fully to Missions when they have an approved Country Development Cooperation Strategy (CDCS) or an approved Feed the Future strategy (for FTF focus countries only). In these countries, Mission Directors will identify a limited number of new project designs for FY 2012 – FY 2013 for which full application of the PD guidance will be applied and also for which project design support will be provided by Washington. In all other cases, Missions are expected to prepare, at minimum, an abbreviated Project Appraisal Document and Project Authorization, in lieu of an Activity Approval Document, for new project designs beginning by July 2012.

Particular projects that could most benefit initially include:

- Projects that intend to use government systems;
- Projects that are multi-sectoral or key to accomplish the associated CDCS Development Objective; and
- Projects of which the Missions anticipates conducting an impact evaluation.

The development of a Concept Paper is optional for these projects. This transition period will allow for advanced acquisition and assistance processes that are already underway to continue. The content of the abbreviated PAD will be determined by the Mission Director, but it must comply with applicable Agency policies and mandatory gender, environmental, and sustainability analyses and include a logical framework, Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, and mandatory pre-obligation materials currently required per **ADS 201.3.11**.

At this time, Washington Operating units may apply those elements of the ADS 201.8 that they find relevant and helpful (such as the logical framework). However, this does not exempt Washington Operating Units from complying with other related requirements, including Agency wide policies and strategies such as the Evaluation Policy, applicable elements of USAID Forward, and mandatory analyses.

#### **201.3.8.2 Project Design Schedule**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

Missions are required to submit to the Regional Bureau and PPL, within four months after CDCS approval, a table that identifies all planned projects anticipated to be designed during FY 2012 and FY 2013. Missions without a CDCS but with an approved FTF strategy for FTF focus countries also must submit a table to the Regional Bureau and PPL that identifies anticipated new planned projects during FY 2012 and FY 2013.

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

In the Project Design Schedule, Mission Directors should indicate which priority new projects would be most appropriate for application of the full PD guidance, including a Concept Paper Peer Review.

### **201.3.8.3 Concept Paper Peer Review**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

For priority projects identified by the Mission Directors, Washington will be included in a technical peer review of Concept Papers. The purpose of these reviews, which would be limited to five working days in duration, is to provide useful input to the Mission from technical specialists. This is not a Washington approval process.

### **201.3.8.4 Project vs. Activity Approval Document (AAD)**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

It is currently common practice at a number of Missions to prepare a Concept Paper and AAD for each new procurement. This practice is no longer applicable for projects under the new PD guidance. Since a project will generally focus on the IR level (or a Development Objective (DO) if it is associated with relatively small levels of resources or is highly integrated) of an approved CDCS, it normally will incorporate a number of different implementation mechanisms.

### **201.3.8.5 Additional Principles of Project Design**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

In addition to the application of the Operational Principles discussed in [ADS 200.3.1](#), there are a number of significant additional principles that apply specifically to the design process as follows:

- **Apply analytic rigor and utilize the best available evidence:** There is always a dynamic tension between the pressure to obligate funds and the time needed for evidence-based project designs. It is essential that project designs not short-change rigorous analysis and the collection of evidence from development experience and lessons learned derived from well documented, rigorous evaluations. In addition to USAID directly producing analytic studies, additional methods for obtaining needed information can be used, such as literature reviews, synthetic analysis of existing knowledge, peer exchange of experimental knowledge, consultations with local thought leaders to elicit local knowledge, etc.

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*



Methods and formats should be matched to available resources and to the knowledge being sought, and should be planned to optimize the analytic gain for the effort and funding available. While lengthy analytic studies will be necessary in some cases, in others, sufficient analyses can be conducted by using interactive formats ranging from face-to-face facilitated workshops to virtual discussions among development experts, and so on.

- **Continuous Learning for Adaptive Management:** Regardless of the approach to analysis, it should be recognized from the outset that the analytic basis for projects continuously needs to be updated, tested, and upgraded. Project design should therefore incorporate plans to reflect on the evidence underlying project design, assess the implications of divergence between anticipated and unanticipated outcomes, and facilitate reflection, additional analytic work, and course correction during project implementation. Missions that have included a focus or component in their Country Development Cooperation Strategy (CDCS) on collaborating, learning, and adapting (CLA) should have a separate implementation plan for operationalizing this component across the Mission portfolio. They should ensure that project designs reflect the projects' relationship to that broader implementation plan.
- **Implement review processes appropriate to a project's cost and complexity:** In addition to conducting analysis, project designs can also be improved through the use of peer input and peer review. This can take a variety of forms, including having USAID/Washington staff undertake an early knowledge management review to identify lessons from similar projects and programs; having a panel of experts participate in a facilitated project design review session; and seeking design and review participation from experts at partner country institutions, U.S. Government and other donor agencies, think tanks, and universities. In consulting outside USAID, judgment must be used to avoid potential conflicts of interest. At a minimum, all projects must undergo an internal multidisciplinary formal review involving various Mission offices and functions.
- **Promote collaboration and mutual accountability among USAID, the partner government and other key stakeholders:** In line with the principles of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, the Accra Agenda for Action, and the principles of USAID Forward, the design process must include the active engagement of partner country governments and civil society, through, for example, joint diagnostic constraints analyses. An explicit assessment of the partner government's capacity and role with regard to project

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

implementation and managing donor resources should also be included. Based on the outcome of that assessment, a decision should be made on the host country's role in the project, and their contribution toward sustainability, including mutual accountability consistent with [ADS 220](#).

- **USAID staff must lead in the project design effort:** USAID staff should carry out the major steps of the project design process. The designated USAID project design team should oversee the analysis, conceptualization, and detailed design aspects of the project. Collaboration, consultations and peer reviews with experts should be used, but USAID staff should have a leading role. USAID staff should serve as the principal liaison with host government officials and with other donors in establishing project priorities and broad design parameters. Where a Mission does not have appropriately skilled staff resources, they may be available from USAID/Washington, including the Pillar Bureaus, Regional Bureaus and PPL.
- **Broaden the range of implementing options to be considered:** Use of partner country agreements and systems, local non-governmental and community-based organizations, agreements with Public International Organizations (PIO), and pooled funding arrangements broaden the range of mechanisms beyond USAID-direct contracts and grants awarded to U.S. organizations. Missions should consider mechanisms being pioneered by USAID's Office of Innovation and Development Alliances (IDEA). The choice of implementing mechanisms is one of the most fundamental considerations in the final stage of project design and has clear linkages to the project's sustainability strategy.

### 201.3.9 The Project Design Process

Effective date: 01/17/2012

The project design process consists of three inter-related stages that refine a project from its strategic basis in a CDCS to a final authorized project. This iterative process will result in a project that is informed by evidence and supported by analytical rigor. The three stages of the design process are: Stage 1, Conceptual; Stage 2, Analytical; and Stage 3, Approval. The following illustrates the progression of project design:

Project design will be documented at each of the three stages in the design process:

- (1) The conceptual stage (resulting in a Concept Paper),

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

**(2)** The analytical stage (resulting in a Project Appraisal Document or PAD), and

**(3)** The approval stage (resulting in a Project Authorization).

As defined in detail below, the purpose of the Concept Paper is to define the tentative parameters of the project, building upon the CDCS Results Framework, and to provide a plan to complete the PAD. The PAD will summarize the analyses used as the foundation of the project design and include:

- A final logical framework matrix;
- An implementation plan and schedule; and
- A monitoring and evaluation plan.

The Project Authorization will include a brief summary of the basic elements of the project, the assistance checklist, a list of required and optional individual clearances, and the signature of the individual (usually the Mission Director) delegated by the Agency to authorize the project for funding and implementation.

#### **201.3.9.1      Stage 1: Concept Stage**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

This stage is estimated at three to four week. During Stage 1, the basic parameters of the project and its further articulation are established using the CDCS or FTF focus strategy as the departure point. Among the activities that occur during Stage 1 of the project design process are:

- (a) Define the Project Design Team:** As early as possible in the process, the Mission Director should formally designate core members of the project design team and include a specific design team leader who will be accountable for guiding the design process from inception to authorization. The design team should include appropriate representation from key support functions as needed in the design process, including the Offices of the Controller, Contracting Officer (CO), RLA, and others as appropriate. It will be important to clearly define and differentiate the role of the Program Office and the lead Technical Office. The role of the Program Office is to be accountable for the overall management of the design process. The Technical Office is accountable for the technical soundness of the design. The Mission Director will determine which of these two will lead the design team.

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

**(b) Define the Problem:** Beginning with the CDCS Results Framework, the Project Design Team needs to review the development challenge addressed by the IR being addressed to ensure specific and accurate problem identification. Usually, the problem statement should be directly linked to a Results Framework. The problem statement will be the focus of the “purpose statement” of the project’s logical framework. When the problem has been clearly identified, it should be restated as the project purpose.

**(c) Develop Preliminary Logical Framework:** Starting with the project purpose, an “if-then” objective tree analysis should be used as the basis for developing the summary narrative portion of the Logical Framework, covering outputs and inputs and including key assumptions. The relationship of the CDCS Results Framework and the Logical Framework is illustrated below.

- **Identify and Analyze the Stakeholders:** It is critical to identify and understand the stakeholders in the project, to include women and men, youth, persons with disabilities, internally displaced persons, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals, and vulnerable populations, in order to help ensure project “buy-in” and the long-term sustainability of the effort. Stakeholders should include the partner country government, civil society and private sector organizations, other donors, and universities.
- **Review Available Knowledge(including research, evaluations, tacit knowledge and lessons-learned):** The design team should cast a broad net to bring into the design process related evaluations, assessments, studies, etc., that may inform the design process including project performance to date for ongoing projects. Where available, the design team should review and compare the unit cost of delivery with other comparable projects. The findings of this review will help define the specific analytical requirements to be undertaken during the preparation of the PAD.

**(d) Define Strategic Partners:** This analysis should identify the roles of potential partners who will be critical to the success of the project and its sustainability building on those partners identified in the CDCS or Initiative strategy and supporting Implementation and Procurement Reform(IPR) objectives. This takes the stakeholder analysis one step further, including identification of potential project design partners outside USAID. A critical aspect of this analysis is to determine partner country participation in project design and implementation,

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

taking into consideration U.S. commitments to the Paris Declaration of Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action. It is at this point that the initial strategy for developing local capacity, using country government systems, and partnering with the private sector should be defined, as well as plans for ongoing engagement with these partners in terms of sharing knowledge and learning from each other as design proceeds. In conducting consultations with non-governmental organizations, Missions should consult with their RLA and GC to avoid giving anyone or organization an unfair competitive advantage.

**(e) Carry out a Public Financial Management Risk Assessment**

**Framework(PFMRAF):** A decision to further assess the use of partner country government systems is fundamental to project design and needs to be factored into the definition and cost of project analysis. For that reason, it is recommended that whenever feasible, Missions should complete the first stage of the PFMRAF (as defined in [ADS 220](#)) prior to drafting any individual project Concept Paper, since this stage of the PFMRAF is at a country level and will apply to all projects. USAID guidance for a process, in conjunction with or in addition to the PFMRAF for incorporating democracy, human rights, and governance considerations into decisions regarding the use of government-to-government assistance, is under development. If partner country government systems are part of the implementing mechanisms to be used, the analysis under [ADS 220](#) must be completed as part of the PAD, leading to a recommendation to use partner country systems. Risk-mitigating measures to permit initial or subsequent use of such systems also must be defined.

**201.3.9.2 Stage 1: Result - Concept Paper**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

The required product from Phase 1 is the Concept Paper, the content of which is described below.

The purpose of the Concept Paper is to provide a summary of a proposed project that can be reviewed by Mission management to assess strategic fit, plausibility of success, underlying assumptions, and manageable interest, among other considerations. Concept Papers minimize the expenditure of resources on fully developed designs until it has been decided that such an effort should be undertaken.

**Concept Paper Content**

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

The Concept Paper itself should be no more than ten pages. Overall, the Concept Paper should define a clear road-map for completion of the project design and PAD, and include cost estimates and timeframes for completing required analysis.

The following is a suggested outline for the Concept Paper:

- Problem Statement and Major Issues
- Relationship to the CDCS, FTF focus strategy, and applicable Agency Policies and Strategies
- Illustrative Interventions
- Analytical Requirements
- Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning
- Preliminary Sustainability Analysis
- Customer/Partner Ownership
- Funding Requirements
- Possible Implementing Mechanisms
- Proposed Design Team and Plan

**(a) Problem Statement and Major Issues:** Identify and briefly describe the problem the project intends to address and the expected outcomes of the project, as described in the preliminary Logical Framework, which is to be included as an annex to the Concept Paper. Analyze and explain the scale of the project's expected accomplishments in relation to the scale of the problem being addressed. In addition, briefly articulate the major issues affecting the development problem.

**(b) Relationship to the CDCS, FTF focus strategy, and applicable Agency Policies and Strategies:** Present a brief discussion of how the planned project will link with, and contribute to, achieving the DO and associated IR(s) in the CDCS (or separate FTF strategy where a CDCS does not exist) as supported by

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

the CDCS development hypothesis. As well as how it will link with any other projects or activities by the partner government or other donors that will make a contribution. It should outline how the project demonstrates alignment with Agency-wide policies and strategies, noting if the Mission has received an exception in accordance with the Administrator's Directive on Policy and Strategy Implementation

(<http://inside.usaid.gov/PPL/offices/p/upload/PolicyDirectiveonImplementation.pdf>).

- (c) Illustrative Interventions/Results:** Present a preliminary list of the activities and interventions that are expected to be implemented, along with corresponding anticipated results, based on the logical framework, with causal linkages between activities and results defined.
- (d) Analytical/Consultation Requirements:** As a result of the initial problem analysis, outline the type of analyses needed, in addition to the three mandatory analyses, and recommend how these analyses will be conducted. What additional evidence from evaluations, research, or other sources will be sought to inform the project design? Which of these analyses have already been completed as part of the CDCS process or which have already been conducted by other parties, including the private sector, think tanks, host governments, other donors, and universities, that can be leveraged? How will cost-benefit and/or cost-effectiveness considerations be included? Project design teams need to balance the benefits of increased evidence-base with the costs in terms of time and resources to conduct multiple analyses, particularly in transition settings where projects need to be designed and implemented quickly.
- (e) Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning:** Identify 1-2 central questions to be evaluated over the course of project execution, considering those identified in the CDCS. If the project is defined as a pilot project, a preliminary evaluation design should be defined to test the implementing mechanism or development hypothesis, and an impact evaluation will be recommended. Preliminary indicators should be identified (and included in the Objectively Verifiable Indicator column in the Logical Framework). For Missions that have a Mission-wide learning and adapting plan, indicate the part each project plays in the larger plan.
- (f) Sustainability Analysis:** The Concept Paper should include a paragraph that summarizes the elements of sustainability considered essential to achieve the project purpose and describes, on a preliminary basis, how sustainability

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

objectives will be integrated throughout the project and how benefits and results will continue.

- (g) Stakeholder/Strategic Partner Ownership and Demand:** Identify the principal stakeholders and potential partners who are critical to the project's success, present an overview of their level of involvement and commitment, including the design phase, and define their interest and project participation.
- (h) Funding Requirements:** Present an overall estimate of the expected costs that will be required to manage and achieve the objectives in the project's preliminary logical framework.
- (i) Possible Implementing Mechanisms:** Assess the likelihood of using partner government systems, or working with and through local organizations. If partner government systems are identified, Stage One (Rapid Appraisal) of the "Public Financial Management Risk Assessment Framework" should be completed before the Concept Paper is approved if possible. The project design team should defer the selection of specific types of implementing mechanisms, such as USAID-managed acquisition or assistance instruments, until later as part of the development of the implementation plan
- (j) Proposed Design Team, Process, Schedule, and Cost:** The Mission Director or his/her designee shall approve who will be responsible for leading the project design team and who will participate (from the USAID Mission, the Country Team, the Regional Mission, AID/W, the partner country); specify their roles and responsibilities; and identify a timeframe for completing the various steps in the process, including any necessary analyses that may be required and their cost. Project committee members outside the Mission, such as officials of the partner government and other key stakeholders, should also be identified.

#### **(k) Preliminary Logical Framework**

##### **Concept Paper Review**

Once the Concept Paper is finalized by the project design committee, it must be circulated widely within the Mission and reviewed in a Mission-wide meeting chaired by the Mission Director or her/his designee. The Program Office will be responsible for organizing the meeting and preparing an Issues Paper that will serve as the agenda for the meeting. The Issues Paper will identify key problems or concerns to be discussed during the Mission review. Explicit decisions to be taken during that Mission review meeting include:

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*



- Agreement on the types of analysis to be completed as part of the project design process (or obtained from other sources);
- Agreement on the plan and budget to complete the PAD;
- Clarifications in the statement of the project purpose to be addressed by the project;
- Issues that must be addressed during the subsequent design process; and
- Estimates of multi-year project budget parameters using the CDCS budget data as a point of departure.

At the conclusion of the review, the Program Office will prepare a memorandum for the Mission Director to approve or disapprove the Concept Paper, and provide whatever guidance may be appropriate for the project design committee in the subsequent stages of the project design if approved.

### **\*201.3.9.3 Stage 2: Analytical Stage**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

This stage takes approximately three to six months. Depending on the complexity of the project, the Analytical Stage of project design requires the most effort, combining completion of all project analyses and their synthesis into a final logical framework and project design. Once the Concept Paper has been approved and the topics of required analyses have been identified, project design should proceed with problem and solution analysis. This should be undertaken and managed directly by USAID, with required analyses undertaken by USAID subject matter experts (including those from Washington or other Missions), local institutions, or local or expatriate contracted specialists as appropriate.

It is important to note that some of the required analytical work may have been completed during the preparation of the CDCS and should be used as appropriate. It is also possible that the partner country, civil society and/or other donors have completed some of the analytical work already.

The project design team must do its best to understand the identified problem or constraints, and identify and assess critical assumptions. These will be considered

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

when the completed design is approved, and serve as the basis for periodic re-validation of the design over the life of project execution.

## Analysis

Not every project will undergo the same breadth and depth of analysis. As outlined above in the Concept Paper, it will be up to the project design committee, under the leadership of the Mission Director, to determine which additional analyses are required (other than the three mandatory analyses). The Mission is not required to justify in the PAD why it did not undertake the non-mandatory analysis. Projects designed in highly dynamic environments may for example reduce the depth of some aspects of analysis at this stage of design and include them in early stages of project implementation. Further description of some of these potential analyses follows:

**(a) MANDATORY.** Gender analysis is a tool for examining the differences between the roles that women and men play in communities and societies, the different levels of power they hold, their differing needs, constraints and opportunities, and the impact of these differences on their lives. At the project level, the gender analysis should identify root causes of existing gender inequalities or obstacles to female empowerment in that context so that USAID can proactively address them in the project design and seek out opportunities to promote women's leadership and participation. Because males and females are not homogenous groups, gender analysis should also to the extent possible disaggregate by income, region, caste, race, ethnicity, disability, and other relevant social characteristics and explicitly recognize the specific needs of young girls and boys, adolescent girls and boys, adult women and men, and older women and men.

In order to ensure that USAID assistance makes possible the optimal contribution to gender equality, in developing strategic plans, DOs, and IRs, Operating Units (OUs) **must** consider the following two questions:

- (1) How will the different roles and status of women and men within the community, political sphere, workplace, and household (for example, roles in decision-making and different access to and control over resources and services) affect the work to be undertaken?
- (2) How will the anticipated results of the work affect women and men differently?

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

The purpose of the first question is to ensure that 1) the differences in the roles and status of women and men are examined; and 2) any inequalities or differences that will impede achieving program or project goals are addressed in the planned work design.

The second question calls for another level of analysis in which the anticipated programming results are: 1) fully examined regarding the possible different effects on women and men; and 2) the design is adjusted as necessary to ensure equitable and sustainable program or project impact (see **ADS 203.6.1**). For example, programming for women's income generation may have the unintended consequence of domestic violence as access to resources shifts between men and women. **Other potential adverse impacts include: (a) Displacing women from access to resources or assets; (b) Increasing the unpaid work or caregiver burden of females relative to males; (c) Conditions that restrict the participation of women or men in project activities and benefits based on pregnancy, maternity/paternity leave, or marital status; (d) Increasing the risk of gender-based violence, including sexual exploitation or human trafficking, sexually transmitted diseases, and HIV/AIDS; and (e) Marginalizing or excluding women in political and governance processes.**

Addressing these questions involves taking into account not only the different roles of men and women, but also the relationship between and among men and women as well as the broader institutional and social structures that support them.

The findings of any analytical work performed during the development of a project or activity design must be integrated into the Statement of Work/requirements definition or the Program Description when the project or activity is to be implemented through an acquisition or assistance award. This will better ensure that as contractors or recipients carry out the projects or programs in their awards, the gender issues identified through the analysis are not overlooked, sidelined, or marginalized. When gender issues are fully integrated into a contract Statement of Work or the Program Description for a grant/cooperative agreement, they are an integral part of the evaluation/selection process for any solicitations financed under the project or activity, such as Requests for Proposal (RFPs), Requests for Task Order Proposal (RFTOPs), Requests for Assistance (RFAs), Leader With Associates (LWA), or Annual Program Statements (APS). Procurements for goods and commodities are excluded from this requirement.

Project design teams must ensure that potential implementers are capable of addressing the gender concerns identified in solicitations. This is done by including performance requirements regarding gender expertise and capacity in the solicitations, tasking offerors and applicants with proposing meaningful approaches to address identified gender issues, and reflecting these performance requirements in technical

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

evaluation and selection criteria (see [302.3.5.15](#) for more detailed acquisition requirements and [303.3.6.3](#) for more detailed assistance requirements).

For technical assistance and additional guidance on integrating findings of gender analyses into projects and activities (including the solicitations funded under those projects and activities), consult the USAID Mission/Office or Bureau gender specialist, or the Office of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GENDEV) in the EGAT Bureau (see also Additional Help documents [201sab, Guide to Gender Integration and Analysis](#), [201 sac, USAID Gender Integration Matrix](#), [201sad, Illustrative Gender Scopes of Work](#), and [201sae, Tips for Conducting a Gender Analysis at the Activity Level](#)).

For information about related topics having to do with this section, such as counter trafficking in persons, see [Mandatory Reference 201mah, Guidance on the Implementation of the Counter Trafficking in Persons \(C-TIP\) Code of Conduct](#). [Guidance on the Implementation of Counter Trafficking in Persons (C-TIP) Code of Conduct was released on 04/22/2011.]

In undertaking gender analyses, USAID OUs are encouraged to draw on similar types of analyses from other donors and partners, to collaborate jointly in preparing gender analyses with other donors and partners, and to share USAID gender analyses with other donors and partners, as appropriate.

If the DO Team determines that gender is not an issue and includes the rationale as part of the Activity Approval Document, it must provide the approved rationale to the Contracting Officer or the Agreement Officer as part of the procurement request documentation for an acquisition or assistance award (see [302.3.5.15](#) and [303.3.6.3](#)).

**(b) Environmental Analysis:** At project design, the Mission must refer to the mandatory biodiversity and forestry assessments undertaken as part of the CDCS process; it may be useful at this time to further refine these assessments to address operational issues, depending on the subject matter of the Project.

At the time of obligation and sub-obligation, the Mission must address environmental impact issues, defined under Regulation 216, (see [ADS 204](#)). Considerations of environmental impact are mandatory for all AID funded programs, on all subjects (except for international disaster assistance).

**(c) Sustainability Analysis:** This is a new requirement for all project designs. Missions are asked to analyze key sustainability issues and considerations

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

around a host of issues including economic, financial, social soundness, cultural, institutional capacity, political economy, technical/sectoral, and environmental. Where appropriate, the analysis should discuss generally how IPR objectives could help achieve sustainability goals. For Presidential Initiative projects, this analysis must determine if/what democratic governance or economic growth interventions should be considered to promote sustainable outcomes.

This analysis also requires a review of the financial costs of the program, its recurrent costs, and its maintenance capability and costs (if applicable), as well as ensuring that future revenues will be adequate. It involves analyzing the institutional capacity that will need to be in place or developed through the project, including systems, policies, and skills. In conflict situations, or other highly volatile environments, sustainability of project benefits may be unpredictable. In those cases, this section should describe what benefits may be sustainable and what may be left to future projects to achieve. The analysis should reference the sustainability objectives of the project or project components (with the understanding that not all projects aim to be fully sustainable at their conclusion), and indicate how the project intends to meet these objectives. Missions should summarize this analysis in a short document to be included in the “Project Analyses” annex to the PAD.

**(d) Economic and Financial Analysis:** Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) is a decision-making approach used to determine if a proposed project is worth doing, or to choose between several alternative ones. It involves comparing the total expected costs of each option against the total expected benefits, to see whether the benefits outweigh the costs, and by how much. CBA is composed of three types of analysis: beneficiary, financial and economic. Beneficiary Analysis identifies the main beneficiaries of a project, classifying them according to broad income categories (poor, near poor, non-poor), gender, and on the likely effects of the proposed activities (direct, less direct and indirect effects). Financial analysis identifies the benefits and costs that will accrue to the beneficiaries, if a project is undertaken. Financial analysis is necessary to ensure that the potential beneficiaries will have an incentive to participate in the project.

Additionally, financial analysis will quantify the financial costs that will have to be borne by the partner country government and/or civil society during the life of the activity and thereafter. Economic Analysis identifies the benefits and costs that will accrue to the host country. It adjusts the financial costs to eliminate transfer payments, such as subsidies and taxes, and uses economic prices that reflect the opportunity cost of resources. Beneficiary, financial, and economic analyses

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

have to be subjected to a risk analysis to determine how variations in the values of the key parameters affect the results.

Risk analysis informs Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E), as it identifies those variables that have the greatest effect on the results (outcomes) of a project. During monitoring, if some of those key variables start to deviate from what was assumed during project design, corrective action can be undertaken. Drawing from the economic and financial analysis, estimates of unit cost should be possible and used to determine how best to contain or minimize unit costs.

**(e) Social Soundness Analysis** has three distinct but related aspects:

- (1) The compatibility of the project with the socio-cultural environment in which it is to be introduced (its socio-cultural feasibility);
- (2) The likelihood that the new practices or institutions introduced to the initial project target population will be diffused among other groups (the spread effect); and
- (3) The social impact or distribution of benefits and burdens among various groups, both within the initial project population and beyond (the incidence).

**(f) Youth Analysis** will

- (1) Enable a better understanding of the country's youth profile and inform program and project focus (by age cohort for example) and modality selection;
- (2) Affirm our commitment to and create avenues for meaningful participation by youth in the design process, with potential for longer-term engagement;
- (3) Underscore that youth are impacted by, and can have impact on, projects in all sectors, and with more youth-sensitive design can come better overall project outcomes; and
- (4) Elevate awareness of and advocate for opportunity and attention to youth among host country and development stakeholders at large.

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

**(g) Institutional Analysis:** Developing local capacity is a core policy objective of the USAID Forward reforms. Such an analysis would require in-depth assessment of the local institutions and systems most critical to the implementation of the project's development interventions, including an assessment of the quality of their leadership, structure and staff, and identification of their administrative and financial management strengths and weaknesses. The institutional values, culture, and decision-making processes (their governance) should also be considered as these directly affect performance and relationships with USAID and other public, private sector and civil society actors.

The analysis should then develop a plan for project activities that are necessary and sufficient to bring these institutions up to the level of performance or engagement as partners appropriate for their roles in the project's implementation and their eligibility for direct USAID funding.

The plan should include an appropriate sustainability strategy to ensure that the institution(s) will remain administratively and financially sustainable by the end of the project and equipped to continue to play their roles in local development.

**(h) Disability Analysis:** In accordance with the USAID Disability Policy, the following issues should be included in project design: (1) promoting the participation and equalization of opportunities of individuals with disabilities in country and sector strategies, activity designs and implementation; (2) increasing awareness of issues of people with disabilities both within USAID programs and in host countries; (3) engaging other U.S. government agencies, host country counterparts, governments, implementing organizations and other donors in fostering a climate of nondiscrimination against people with disabilities; and (4) supporting international advocacy for people with disabilities. (See full text of the policy paper at <http://dec.usaid.gov/index.cfm>).

**(i) Climate Change Vulnerability Analysis:** This analysis seeks to identify: 1) whether and how the project will affect, or be affected by, medium- and longer-term climate change impacts; and 2) if the project's design should be adjusted in consideration of climate change vulnerabilities. The basis of this analysis should be a review of a country's medium- to long-term climate change vulnerability forecast (i.e. how and where within a country will climate change vulnerability manifest itself). The CDCS will have provided considerable attention to climate change issues for each DO. Considerations, for example, may affect which crops are planted and in which areas, water resource and management requirements,

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

and location sustainability. If the project is expected to increase greenhouse gas emissions, then alternative lower-carbon development strategies should be considered.

**(j) Conflict Analysis:** This analysis seeks to identify and prioritize the causes and consequences of violence and instability in a given country context, understand how existing development programs interact with these factors, and determine where development and humanitarian assistance can most effectively support local efforts to manage conflict and build peace (summarized from the Conflict Assessment Framework (CAF) from USAID's Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation). Such analysis serves as a foundation for more effective U.S. engagement in most countries where USAID is present, thus is generally undertaken in conjunction with strategic planning.

**(k) Political Economy Analysis (PEA):** PEA is an emerging approach that attempts to address the interrelated political and economic interests that underlie governance challenges and that either stand in the way or facilitate good development performance and successful achievement of the project purpose. PEA approaches are tools for examining the dynamic relationship between political, economic and societal forces supporting and inhibiting sustainable change, based on an assessment of the underlying political dynamics of the society. This is an area of emerging Agency experience.

## Synthesis

The synthesis step in the analytical phase is to review the options and evidence, based on the above analyses, to solve the identified problem. Elements of the synthesis process can be undertaken in parallel to the above analysis. During project synthesis, consideration of alternative solutions to the identified problem should be explicit. Various possible solutions should be assessed in terms of how well they might resolve the development problem considering cost and sustainability. Synthesis must cover not only the technical approach, but also issues such as social soundness, institutional questions, partner country commitment, project implementation issues and Mission project management.

This is also the time to ensure that USAID Forward and the Policy Framework operational principles have been considered, and where appropriate, factored into final project design. For example, this is the stage of the process where the evaluation is designed along with the rest of the undertakings. This is the time and place to focus on sustainability, one of the most central of all the operational principles, and to consider

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*



direct partnerships with partner country government institutions and/or local civil society and private sector organizations.

#### **201.3.9.4 Stage 2: Result - Project Appraisal Document (PAD)**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

The required product for Stage III is a completed PAD, as outlined below. The PAD documents the complete project design and serves as the reference document for Project Authorization and subsequent implementation. As described below, the PAD should: define the development problem to be addressed by the project; provide a description of the technical approach to be followed during implementation; define the expected results at the output, purpose, and goal level (as presented in the final logical framework including objectively verifiable indicators); outline the analytical and sustainability considerations; present the financial plan and detailed budget; present an overall project implementation plan; and present the monitoring and evaluation plan.

The PAD is the baseline for project implementation, adaptation, and evaluation. It synthesizes the various analyses that underlie and rationalize the project design, and assesses the overall feasibility of project success. It is also the baseline against which the project may be realigned during implementation, since the development process is dynamic and project activities may need adjustment, or aspects of the project logical framework require reworking in light of unforeseen circumstances. Finally, the PAD provides a reference point for comparing the value of alternative investments for the purposes of resource allocations and budget justifications.

#### **PAD Content**

The PAD should be between 20-25 pages, excluding annexes. In many cases, the PAD will update data included in the Concept Paper. The body of the PAD should summarize briefly data included in the appendices.

The length of the document, in part, is a function of the size and complexity of the project itself. The basic sections of the document will include (executive summary optional):

- Relationship to Mission CDCS and Results Framework
- Relationship to Partner Country and Other Donor Programs
- Project Description

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

- Implementation Plan
- Summary Cost Estimate and Financial Plan
- Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Learning Approach
- Analytical and Sustainability Considerations
- Conditions, Covenants and/or Actions Required
- Annexes

**(a) Relationship to Mission CDCS and Other USG Programs:** This section should describe the relationship of the project to the CDCS (or Presidential Initiative Strategy) at the IR or DO level. The development problem/hypothesis and the expected impact of the project in terms of the Results Framework should be identified and described. Relationships to other IRs or DOs, or to ongoing activities managed by the Mission, should be identified and described. Missions also should ensure close coordination with other USG projects.

**(b) Relationship to Partner Country, Local Stakeholders and Other Donor Programs:** The relationship of the project to Partner Country and citizens' planning priorities in the context of Aid Effectiveness Principles should be described, including level of Partner Country commitment to the purpose of the project and any identified division of labor to achieve project results. Other donor funding that will have a material effect in the success of the project should also be described.

**(c) Summary Project Description:** This section should begin with a summary presentation of the project logical framework, including key assumptions, relationship to development hypothesis, geographic focus, and brief descriptions of the planned inputs, outputs, and purpose-level accomplishments and their specific linkages to the CDCS Results Framework. More detail is provided as a PAD attachment.

**(d) Implementation Plan:** The section should summarize the time-phased implementation plan, defining important implementation actions and decision points by time over the life of the project. The plan should be more detailed in the first year. A sub-set of the overall implementation plan should be an A&A

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

Strategy that identifies all significant procurement actions and their associated development, implementation and close-out activities. If partner country systems will be utilized during implementation to support IPR objectives, this section should summarize the appropriate assessments that have been done to identify and, as appropriate, mitigate risk associated with use of partner country government systems and institutions. Finally, the Mission's plan to manage the project, defining office roles and responsibilities and staffing requirements, also should be included. More detail is provided as a PAD attachment.

- (e) Summary Financial Plan and Budget:** A summary budget for all contributions (fund sources) to the costs of the project should be included by year (USAID, Partner Government, other sources). Ideally, the budget should be presented by input as well as outcome (output or purpose-level achievement). The financial plan will include USAID funding requirements by fiscal year and account for the life of the project, illustrating the link to the Framework and the CDCS Results Framework, and outlining any other pertinent directives. One element of USAID costs is associated with facility, equipment, staff and contractor costs of security, particularly in high-threat environments. More detail is provided as a PAD attachment.
- (f) Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Learning Approach:** This section should summarize the plans for project monitoring and evaluation (indicating how the project is complying with USAID's Evaluation Policy). The plans should clearly describe how the project will collect needed data from project inception (baseline data), and periodically over the life of the project for both monitoring and evaluation purposes. If an impact evaluation is planned, its design should be summarized in this section. Impact evaluation design requires that project implementation consistently respect the separation of the 'target' group from the 'control' group throughout the life of the project. If a Mission has a learning or adapting approach and implementation plan, this section should indicate the project's role in implementation and how the Mission will utilize this approach to achieve adaptive management during implementation. More detail is provided as a PAD attachment.
- (g) Analytical and Sustainability Considerations:** This section should summarize the evidence that suggest that the project will succeed, underlying assumptions, and, where available, outline how it will be cost effective compared to similar projects and alternatives. This section should reference the various analyses done to support articulation of the final project design and logical framework (as included in attachment k), and reference any key evaluations that influence

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

project design. Specifically, this section should summarize the key findings of the Mission sustainability analysis. More detail is provided as a PAD attachment.

**(h) Other Required Actions:** This section should define what actions prior to project execution, if any, need to be taken by the Partner Government, or ongoing mutual agreements or actions (usually referred to as “covenants”) that need to be specified in any subsequent bilateral project agreement with the partner country. Also, any waivers should be identified.

**(i) Annexes:**

- (1)** Draft Project Authorization (including Approval of Use of Partner Country Government Systems, if appropriate)
- (2)** Logical Framework and CDCS Results Framework
- (3)** Concept Paper Approval Memorandum
- (4)** Expanded Project Description
- (5)** Financial Plan and Detailed Cost Estimate
- (6)** Implementation Plan and Schedule
- (7)** A&A Strategy
- (8)** Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Learning Approach
- (9)** Public Financial Management Risk Assessment Framework (if applicable)
- (10)** Project Analyses
- (11)** Environmental Threshold Decision (based on Initial Environmental Examination)
- (12)** Country and Assistance Checklists
- (13)** Waivers, Certifications, and Other Project-Specific Information

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

**Additional descriptions of selected Annexes (2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, and 13):**

- **Logical Framework:** Producing the PAD will require completing a final version of the logical framework as informed by the results of the analysis and synthesis phases of the design process. Initial means of verification should be identified, which will be finalized in the Performance Management Plan.
- **Expanded Project Description:** Building upon the summary project description, the design team should describe the selected technical approach based on the synthesis of the analytical work undertaken or consulted during the design process. Significant differences between the technical approach described herein and the Concept Paper should be identified, as well as how any areas raised in the Issues Paper resulting from the Concept Paper review were resolved. Finally, identified major assumptions, risks, and contingencies should be assessed with an overall statement of project feasibility.
- **Financial Plan and Cost Estimate:** A multi-year financial plan and project budget is required that provides estimated project costs from all sources, including USAID. This plan should include M&E costs and will be the basis for Mission multi-year budget requests.
- **Implementation Plan and Schedule:** The design team will develop a comprehensive set of implementation modalities, activities and outputs, including a preliminary life-of-project schedule and defined exit strategy. The level of detail and specificity is meant to help the design team clarify and vet their understanding of the major activities, inputs, data requirements for monitoring and evaluation, implementation mechanism, and capacity development needs of prospective local partners. In the PAD, the greatest level of detail will focus on Year One of the project, with significantly less specificity for the out-years. Drawing from the Assumptions in the logical framework where possible, the plan should anticipate that unexpected outcomes, newly available knowledge, changes in country conditions, and/or other kinds of change may occur, and thus should build in learning processes for periodically reviewing and analyzing the implications of these changes, developing contingency plans, adapting implementation as necessary, and sharing the results of these analyses within USAID and with partners, partner government counterparts, other donors and other stakeholders.

If partner country systems are part of the implementing mechanisms to be used to support IRP objectives, the analysis under ADS 220 must be

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

completed, leading to a recommendation to use partner country systems. Risk-mitigating measures to permit initial or subsequent use of such systems also must be defined.

- **A&A Strategy:** As a component of the implementation plan, the A&A Strategy should be developed in consultation with the Program Office, Contracting Officer, RLA and Controller. Normally the PAD will describe and justify the 'choice of instruments' (assistance or acquisition), if sufficient detail is available for the Contracting Officer to make that judgment. In preparing the A&A Strategy, the Project Design team should work closely with the Contracting Officer to determine the need for any special approvals or waivers linked to procurement, such as for restricted commodities, source and nationality, or competition, which should be identified in a PAD Annex. The A&A Strategy should identify acquisition and assistance awards requiring the preparation of an "Individual Acquisition and Assistance Plan," to address FAR Part 7 requirements.
- **Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Learning Approach:** Development of the Monitoring Plan and Evaluation Plan is an essential step to manage the process of assessing and reporting progress towards achieving project outputs and outcomes, and to identify what evaluation questions will be addressed through evaluation. The M&E Plans contribute to the effectiveness of the CDCS-level Performance Management Plan (PMP), as well as the project itself, by assuring that comparable data will be collected on a regular and timely basis. At the design stage, the project monitoring and evaluation information that needs to be identified includes the following:
  - (1) Performance measures to be used to monitor each level of the project results (Project Goal, Purpose, Outputs), and provide a precise definition for each indicator. The Project Goal and Purpose indicators should be consistent with those included in the CDCS. In the Logical Framework, these are known as Objectively Verifiable Indicators.
  - (2) Data sources and the methodologies of data collection. In the Logical framework these are known as the Means of Verification.
  - (3) A plan for collection of baseline data at the beginning of project implementation, including methodology for that collection.

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

- (4) Identification of needed evaluations and suggestions of appropriate methods if external evaluations are required.
- (5) Using M&E Plans to define indicators, sources, and methods of data collection increases the likelihood that the project will collect comparable data over time, even when key personnel change. M&E Plans also support reliable data collection by prescribing the frequency and schedule of data collection and assigning responsibilities. Identifying key evaluation questions at the outset will both improve the quality of the project design and guide data collection and evaluation during implementation. Analyzing the need for evaluations during the project (tied to some threshold or key decision) and at the end of the project (either for decisions or to capture learning) lays the foundation for allocating sufficient evaluation resources and planning in a way that allows the use of the best methods for quality evaluation. Missions also should identify what support is needed from Washington to implement.
- **Project Analysis:** The PAD should include the actual analysis conducted or used to design the project. In particular, this section should contain the three mandatory analyses and document all factors identified, including the mandatory sustainability analysis referenced in Analysis section 201.3.9.3 above.
  - **Country and Assistance Checklists:** The Country Checklist, done annually before the initial obligation for the particular country involved (which in many cases will be a DO Agreement or amendment), should be attached. The Assistance Checklist is sometimes prepared at the DO level, if projects/activities that come under the DO have been designed. If this is the case, the Assistance Checklist should be attached. Where a new project is being designed, the Assistance Checklist should be prepared and attached to the PAD in an Annex. The Project Design Team should consult their RLA concerning contents of the Assistance Checklist (For further information, see 201.3.12).
  - **Waivers, Certifications, and Other Project-Specific Information:** This Annex should contain any project-specific waivers, certifications or other pertinent information. Examples include source and nationality waivers, special justifications for awards to PIOs (responsibility determination),

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

competition waivers, Approval of Use of Partner Country Systems (AUPCS), use of Host Country-Owned Foreign Currency ([ADS 624](#) and [627](#)), etc.

### **PAD Review**

The final Mission review of the PAD follows the same procedures used for the Concept Paper. The PAD will be circulated to all Mission offices and reviewed in a meeting chaired by the Mission Director. The Program Officer will be responsible for orchestrating the review meeting, including drafting an issues paper based on input from involved Mission offices. The issues paper should focus on

- Major points of clarification,
- Areas that lack consensus,
- Extent of perceived risk,
- Probability of success, etc.

Some adjustments may have to be made in the draft PAD as a result of the Mission review. Normally, it will be the role of the Program Office to make the required adjustments, finalize the PAD, and prepare for the final stage of project design – Project Authorization.

### **201.3.9.5 Stage 3: Project Authorization (estimated 3 pages)**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

The Project Authorization gives substantive approval for a project to move from the planning stage to implementation. It does not reserve or commit funds. The Project Authorization

- (1) Approves the project design detailed in the PAD,
- (2) Sets out the purpose of the project,
- (3) Sets the duration (defines an end of project date),
- (4) Defines fundamental terms and conditions of the assistance when a partner country agreement is anticipated,

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*



- (5) Approves an overall total budget level, subject to the availability of funds, for the project, and
- (6) Approves any waivers that may be needed for project implementation (to the extent identified at the time of authorization).

Waivers will also be included and documented in the Project Authorization. As highlighted in the Implementation Policy section above, the Project Authorization is required for all new projects, regardless of the size or type of the project or method of financing and obligation.

For projects that include use of partner country systems for implementation, the Project Authorization also will document the Approval of Use of Partner Country Systems, as required by [ADS 220](#). Since use of partner country government systems will require execution of a bilateral agreement with the partner country obligating (or sub-obligating) funds for the project components to be implemented through partner country systems), the Project Authorization also may include the most critical terms and conditions required by USAID for that bilateral agreement.

The Project Authorization will in addition record final clearances from each Mission office with responsibility for project design and for Mission compliance with USAID policies and procedures. These offices must include the RLA, the Contracting Officer, and the Controller. Others in the clearance process will include the involved technical office(s) and the Program Office. The Mission Director (or other official delegated the authority to approve the project) will sign the Authorization and the signed version of the Project Authorization will be included in the final PAD. Attachment 1 provides a sample Authorization template.

### **Amendments to the PAD and Project Authorization**

The PAD and Project Authorization need to be amended formally through an Action Memorandum approved by the Mission Director under the following circumstances:

- The amount of USAID funding for the projects is increased or decreased by 10% of the initial project;
- The defined end date of the project requires an extension of more than six months; or

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

- The project purpose requires substantive modification (such as modifications in the Project Purpose, expected outputs and significant targets and benchmarks at the purpose level).

The rationale for these changes will be documented by an amendment to the PAD.

### **201.3.9.6 Stage 3: Result - Project Authorization to Implementation**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

Project implementation does not ‘begin’ with the signing of the Project Authorization. Implementation and A&A planning, definition of the roles and responsibilities of partner country government systems, and other steps completed in the design process should expedite initiation of assistance and acquisition actions and obligation (or sub-obligation) of funds through government-to-government(G2G) agreements, agreements with PIO’s, and agreements with other implementing partners as defined in the implementation plan.

During the design process, the choices of these implementation mechanisms should be made, basic scopes of work/terms of reference drafted, and budgets allocated for each mechanism. This should significantly facilitate preparation of RFPs or RFAs for USAID-direct awards and drafting of bilateral agreements in the case of G2G agreements.

Regarding Mission management, the project management plan developed in the PAD can immediately be implemented, with clear roles assigned to technical and other Mission offices. Since the RLA, Controller, and Contracting/Assistance staffs have been part of the design and approval process, they should be able to focus on moving ahead with initial project implementation. Clear performance benchmarks are part of the implementation planning process, launching project monitoring from the start.

### **Illustrative Draft Project Authorization Template**

**Name of Country:**

**Name of Project:**

#### **(1) Project Definition:**

- Pursuant to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, I hereby authorize the [title of project] involving planned total obligations not to exceed [total life-of-project funding provided under the FAA] over a

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

[length of time usually expressed in years] from the date of authorization subject to the availability of funds in accordance with the USAID appropriation and allotment process. Funds will be made available in United States dollars and local currency as deemed necessary and appropriate.

- The purpose of the project is to [briefly define the project purpose and project outputs]

**(2) Source and Nationality:**

- Goods and services financed by USAID under the Grant shall have their source and nationality in the United States and [define geographic code – in most cases, “other countries included in Geographic Code 937”].

**(3) Approval of the Use of Partner Country Systems (AUPCS):** [If applicable]  
I hereby approve the use of the Government of [country] government systems to implement specific components of the Project based on the detailed financial and risk assessment and mitigating measures defined in the PAD and mutually agreed by the Government of [country]. The Project Agreement will further specify the terms and conditions under which USAID funds will be provided to, and expended by, the Government of [country].

**(4) Condition Precedent to Disbursement of Project Funds to the Government of [country]** [if applicable]

**(5) Special Covenants** [for Partner Country Bilateral Agreements – if applicable]

**(6) Definition of Use of Partner Country-Owned Local Currency** [if applicable]

**(7) Waivers** [such as Source and Nationality]

**(8) Special Justifications** [such as awards to PIOs (responsibility determinations)]

Signed, Mission Director

Clearances:

Program Officer, Controller, Regional Legal Advisor, Etc.

**201.3.10 Sub-Obligations**

Effective date: 09/01/2008

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

If USAID directly implements activities under a Development Objective Agreement, then USAID sub-obligates funds by signing grants, cooperative agreements, contracts, or other instruments. If the host country government directly implements activities under an Assistance Agreement, then USAID commits funds through a subsequent agreement with the host country government. If using host-country contracting, see [ADS 305](#) and [ADS 220](#).

### **201.3.11 Pre-Obligation Requirements**

Effective date: 01/31/2003

USAID Missions and B/IOs must ensure that all pre-obligation requirements labeled as —mandatory in this ADS section have been met before USAID-appropriated funds are obligated. The completion of these requirements must be adequately documented.

Many, although not all, of the pre-obligation requirements are based on statute or regulation. One of the statutory pre-obligation requirements is Section 611(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act (FAA), which requires that there be adequate technical and financial planning for all obligations in excess of \$500,000.

**Sec. 611.Completion of Plans and Cost Estimates.—** (a) No agreement or grant that constitutes an obligation of the United States Government in excess of \$500,000 under section 1501 of title 31, United States Code, shall be made for any assistance authorized under chapter I of part I, title II of chapter 2 of part I, or chapter 4 of part II—

- (1) If such agreement or grant requires substantive technical or financial planning, until engineering, financial, and other plans necessary to carry out such assistance, and a reasonably firm estimate of the cost to the United States Government of providing such assistance, have been completed; and
- (2) If such agreement or grant requires legislative action within the recipient country, unless such legislative action may reasonably be anticipated to be completed in time to permit the orderly accomplishment of the purposes of such agreement or grant.

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

The FAA Section 611(a) requirement for adequate planning before obligation may be met in several ways:

- A project or activity may be fully planned at the time of obligation. Before 1995, USAID's predominant practice was to complete all activity planning before obligation. This remains the practice for many programs that do not obligate through an Assistance Agreement.
- In many cases, the planning done while developing an Assistance Agreement or other government-to-government obligating instrument for a DO may also contain enough detail to satisfy the pre-obligation requirements.
- If all detailed project or activity planning is not completed before Assistance Agreement obligation, FAA Sec. 611(a) requirements must be met by establishing, before obligation, criteria and procedures for activity selection, together with a list of illustrative activities with estimated budgets. The key is to demonstrate, at the time of obligation, the **feasibility** of achieving the result for which the obligation is made. In this case, the detailed planning requirements must be met at the time of approval of each specific project or activity and before sub-obligation.

Although FAA Section 611(a) applies only to obligations in excess of \$500,000, USAID requires that adequate technical and financial planning must be conducted for all obligations, regardless of size. The minimum requirements that must be met before any obligation of funds are as follows:

**a. Adequate Planning.** The assistance must be adequately planned and described. The degree of planning required before obligation varies depending on the nature of the assistance and the nature of the chosen obligating instrument. The following minimum mandatory requirements are designed to ensure that USAID Missions and B/IOs adequately plan all assistance before obligation.

- **Link to Approved Foreign Assistance Framework and Joint Country Assistance Strategy or USAID Country Strategic Plan.** Planning documentation must indicate how the assistance will use USG resources to support achievement of transformational diplomacy results consistent with country aims under the Foreign Assistance Framework.

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

USAID Missions and B/IOs must show how the assistance is linked to a result or set of results specified in a Results Framework and how those intended results will be achieved. (The latter requirement normally includes describing links between implementing organizations and ultimate customers, use of USAID and partner personnel, and definition of overall responsibilities and authorities.)

- **Illustrative Budget.** Planning for the assistance must include an illustrative budget that provides a reasonably firm estimate of the cost of the assistance to the USG for the duration of activities comprising the scope of work.
- **Plan for Monitoring Performance.** Planning for the assistance must include a plan for monitoring adequacy of outputs and their effectiveness in achieving intended results, including any applicable results promoting aid effectiveness. This plan should form part of the Performance Management Plan (PMP) for the broader DO plan.

For additional information, please refer to the following mandatory references:

- [Section 611\(a\) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961](#), as amended
- [ADS 203](#)
- [ADS 302](#)
- [ADS 303](#)
- [ADS 305](#)
- [ADS 306](#)
- [ADS 308](#)
- [ADS 312](#)
- [AIDAR](#)

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

- [22 CFR 226](#)

- [22 CFR 228](#)

When planning to use USAID direct obligating mechanisms, if the DO Team, working with its Contracting or Agreement Officer, anticipates the need to create, modify, revise, or waive any existing acquisition and assistance policy or procedures, as identified in any of the above regulations or their mandatory internal references, the Contracting or Agreement Officer must coordinate with the Policy Division of the Office of Acquisition and Assistance, Bureau for Management (M/OAA/P) at the earliest opportunity.

**b. Environmental Impact Assessment.** This is a legal requirement that may not be waived, modified, or eliminated. A Bureau Environmental Officer's authority and responsibility to approve decisions under this Federal Regulatory process may not be delegated to the field.

Federal Law mandates that an Initial Environmental Examination (IEE), Request for Categorical Exclusion (CE), Environmental Assessment (EA), or other appropriate action under the USAID Environmental Procedures promulgated in 22 CFR 216 must be completed for the DO or substantive project, or activity or amendment thereto and approved in writing by the relevant Bureau Environmental Officer before the obligation of funds. (See the Mandatory References [22 CFR 216](#) and [ADS 204](#) for details, and consult with the Regional Bureau Environmental Officer or the Agency Environmental Coordinator.)

In addition to being a legal requirement, adequate review of environmental considerations optimizes development results, builds democracy, ensures wise investment of taxpayer money, and manages risk. It normally requires a relatively detailed description and analysis of planned interventions, recommended mitigative measures, and local public participation in the review process. DO Teams are responsible for planning adequate time and resources to complete this environmental impact assessment process prior to deadlines for obligating funds.

If DO Teams are unable to undertake adequate environmental impact assessment at the pre-obligation planning stage, they must, at minimum, request and receive from their Bureau Environmental Officer a written approval to defer review and incorporate appropriate mandatory conditions prior to disbursement (or conditions precedent to disbursement in the case of

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

a bilateral obligation). In such a case of temporary deferral, this approval will ensure proper environmental review before disbursement. DO Teams must be prepared to modify and fully fund any revisions to the Assistance Agreement and its projects or activities, if necessary, in accordance with the outcome of the environmental impact assessment process when it is completed.

- **Biosafety.** If projects or activities will potentially involve the use of genetically modified organisms in research, field trials, or dissemination, they must be reviewed and approved for compliance with applicable U.S. requirements by the Agency biosafety staff in Washington before the obligation of funds and before the transfer, testing, or release of biotechnology products into the environment.
- The biosafety review that is reviewed and approved is limited to the safety aspects of the proposed activities and often involves external peer review or demonstration of comparable safety oversight by other expert U.S. Federal agencies. This biosafety determination is separate from, and should precede and inform, the [22 CFR 216](#) environmental impact assessment process. Because it precedes the 22 CFR 216 process, DO Teams should budget adequate time and funding in the design process for this review. It may be difficult to predict the amount of time needed, because reviews are highly dependent on the amount of analysis and information provided, whether other expert Federal agency biosafety reviews have been completed, whether additional information will be required, and whether external peer reviews will be undertaken. Therefore, it is important for a DO Team to contact USAID/Washington as early in a design process as possible to ensure timely handling.
- Biosafety review cannot be waived or delegated to the field. Please consult directly with Agency biosafety staff, such as the International Research and Biotechnology Team in the EGAT Bureau, the Agency Environmental Coordinator, or the Senior Science Advisor for the Bureau for Global Health (GH) if there is a potential for the use of genetically modified organisms.

**c. Country-Level Statutory Review (“Country Checklist”).** For information on a country checklist, which must be prepared for the country or countries for which the activity will provide assistance.

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*



- d. **Obligation-Level Statutory Review (“Assistance Checklist”).** An activity checklist must be prepared for each obligation and reviewed at the time of each sub-obligation to comply with applicable statutes.
- e. **Other USAID Policy Requirements.** Prior to obligation, other USAID policy requirements may need to be met; for example, justifications for other than full and open competition or documentation of the use of notwithstanding authority.
- f. **Approval by an Authorized Official.** An authorized official must approve the assistance, as described in [ADS 103.3.8](#).
- g. **Congressional Notification.** Congress must be notified and there must be no outstanding congressional objection. (See the Mandatory Reference, [FAA Section 634A, Foreign Operations Appropriations Act](#) provisions for relevant fiscal year.)
- h. **Funds Availability.** Funds must be available before actual obligation and their availability formally shown on the record. (see the Mandatory Reference, [Federal Anti-Deficiency Act – 31 U.S.C. Section 1341\(a\)\(1\)](#) and [FAA Section 634A, Foreign Operations Appropriations Act](#))

Also see the Additional Help document, [200sar, Model Checklist for Pre-Obligation Requirements](#).

## **201.3.12 Country Prohibitions and Restrictions**

Effective date: 01/31/2003

USAID must manage its programs and operations in compliance with applicable legal restrictions (statutory and regulatory).

Legal restrictions are expressed in a variety of ways, such as restricting assistance to a particular country, a category of countries (such as those that are in arrears in repayment of debt to the U.S. Government), or in terms of a particular type of assistance (such as police assistance). USAID Missions and Bureaus/Independent Offices (B/IOs) should use two types of checklists to assist in compliance with country restrictions: the “country” checklist and the “assistance” checklist. Each checklist summarizes various legal restrictions and provides a simple way to confirm and document that USAID-funded programs comply with restrictions. Both checklist

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

templates are updated annually by the Office of General Counsel (GC) to reflect changes in legal restrictions and are available from GC or Regional Legal Advisors (RLAs). (See Additional Help document, **USAID Statutory Checklists** at the internal Website, <http://inside.usaid.gov/AGC/guidance.html>.)[Note: this document is only available on the intranet.] These checklists do not contain the entire universe of legal restrictions that may be applicable in every instance. GC and RLAs determine whether particular countries or activities are affected by legal restrictions and whether particular waiver authorities may be exercised based on facts provided by USAID Missions and B/IOs. Public-private alliances are not exempt from these regulations, and early consultation with GC and RLAs is advised for those projects. The requirements for each statutory checklist are as follows:

**a. Country Checklist.** USAID Missions and B/IOs must complete a country checklist each fiscal year before initiating obligation of assistance for that country. For countries with programs managed by Regional Bureaus or for USAID Missions in the field, country checklists are prepared by the responsible Regional Bureau (typically by the Bureau country desk officer) and cleared by GC. Note that other units, such as USAID/Washington's Office of the Chief Financial Officer (M/CFO) and State, may make determinations or provide information used in addressing checklist items.

Because facts that trigger restrictions may change during the fiscal year, and occasionally new restrictions are enacted, USAID Missions and B/IOs should ensure that additional legal restrictions have not been triggered before each additional obligation of funds for a given country (for example, indebtedness provisions).

**b. Assistance Checklists.** USAID Missions and B/IOs must complete activity checklists before initiating obligation. The checklist should be completed once for the life of the DO unless substantial changes are made in the nature of the projects or activities being implemented under that objective. In the event of changes, the most recent checklist should be completed to confirm that legal restrictions do not apply. GC and RLA may require USAID Missions and B/IOs to complete activity checklists more often to ensure compliance with recent legislation. USAID Missions and B/IOs should consult with GC or RLA to find out if a new activity checklist should be completed before each obligation. For information about pre-obligation requirements, USAID Missions and B/IOs should consult with GC or RLAs for guidance if they are considering a waiver of any part of an activity checklist.

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

**201.3.13 Use of Checklists and Clearance Sheets**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

To the extent practicable, documentation required to satisfy pre-obligation requirements should be included in the project PAD. This may not be possible in the case of bilateral assistance agreements with host governments at the DO level or if Missions or B/IOs are obligating funds through USAID-direct mechanisms (e.g. grants, cooperative agreements or contracts) outside of a project PAD. To address this problem, some USAID Missions and B/IOs have adopted as a best practice a concise checklist of pre-obligation and activity planning requirements to confirm to the obligating official that the required documentation has been prepared and specify where it may be found. A copy of such a checklist is provided in the Additional Help document, 200sar, Model Checklist for Pre-Obligation Requirements.

Some USAID Missions and B/IOs in the field also use special clearance requirements and clearance sheets to help ensure that all requirements are met before obligation and project/activity approval. Clearances by specified officers (such as the program officer, controller, regional legal advisor, contracting officer, and other DO Team members) are used to confirm to the obligating and approving officials and for the record that pre-obligation and project or activity planning requirements have been met and that obligating instruments contain all necessary clauses consistent with law, regulation, and policy, including counterpart funding requirements. Such clearances may accompany a bilateral agreement or be recorded in conjunction with a A&A request in GLAAS.

**201.3.14 Public Access to Planning Documents**

Effective date: 01/31/2003

USAID employees are often requested to provide various planning information to stakeholder, partner, customer organizations, and the general public. Staff also receives requests from other USAID Missions and B/IOs for planning documentation throughout the year. This section provides guidelines on what planning information can be released to whom and when it can be released.

**201.3.15 Principles Governing Release of Information**

Effective date: 09/01/2008

As a general policy, USAID encourages its staff to include stakeholders, partners, and customers in developing USAID DO plans and related activities. Nonetheless, at some stages of preparation, USAID is required to limit, temporarily, access to planning documents and their review. There are three basic reasons for such restrictions.

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

- In procurement, issues of organizational conflict of interest and unfair competitive advantage influence the degree to which partner organizations may be involved in activity design. For a full description of these restrictions, see [ADS 202.3.9](#) and the Additional Help document, [Legal and Policy Considerations when Involving Partners and Customers on SO Teams and Other Consultations](#).
- Release of “budget information” is governed by Section 22 of [OMB Circular A-11](#). It provides that the nature and amounts of the President’s budget decisions and the underlying materials are confidential. It prohibits the release of the President’s decisions outside of the Executive Branch until the budget is transmitted to Congress. It prohibits the release of any materials underlying those decisions at any time, except in accordance with section 22.

Budget information is the Executive Branch communications that leads to the President’s budget decisions. It includes agency justifications and any agency future year plans or long-range estimates provided to OMB. Do not release Agency justifications, Operational Plans, or other future year plans or long-range estimates provided to OMB to anyone outside the Executive Branch, except in accordance with this section.

“Budget information” does not include Agency planning documents, such as planning parameters and USAID Mission and B/IO plans in their early stages. The information in such documents is not definite enough to represent an Agency viewpoint. Operational Plans and documents that have been submitted for review by State/F are considered planning documents. Therefore, USAID Missions and B/IOs can share funding options and other information with partners and others as they are drafting such planning documents. Documents that have gone through the State/F review process and have been revised and adopted by the Agency as an Agency decision become budget information, unless the budget information is labeled as illustrative. Approved documents with illustrative budget information are considered planning documents.

- Foreign policy sensitivity concerns at the host country level may at times affect release of country-level planning documentation to host country partners and the host country general public. Consult with Embassy representatives if you believe there may be sensitivity concerns.

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

**201.3.16 Guidelines for Managing Access to Information**

Effective date: 09/01/2008

For USAID and other U.S. Government employees, there are no restrictions on accessing planning information. Many planning documents are included in the Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC). For more information about accessing DEC, see [ADS 203.3.12](#). Other documents are posted on the USAID internal or external Web sites (documents posted on these Websites do not include budgetary information).

There are some restrictions about providing access to USAID planning documents to those who are not authorized to perform inherently governmental functions. For guidance and examples, please consult the Additional Help document, Legal and Policy Considerations when Involving Partners and Customers on DO Teams and Other Consultations.

**201.4 MANDATORY REFERENCES**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

**201.4.1 External Mandatory References**

Effective date: 01/17/2012

The external mandatory reference documents mentioned in this ADS chapter are listed below. Due to the interrelated nature of ADS chapters 200-203, please also consult the comprehensive list of documents in [ADS 200.4.1](#).

- a. [22 CFR 216, Environmental Procedures](#)
- b. [22 CFR 226, Administration of Awards to U.S. Non-Governmental Organizations](#)
- c. [22 CFR 228, Rules on Source, Origin and Nationality for Commodities and Services Financed by USAID](#)
- d. [Federal Acquisition Regulation \(FAR\)](#)
- e. [Federal Anti-Deficiency Act – 31 U.S.C. Section 1341\(a\)\(1\)](#)
- f. [Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended](#)
- g. [Government Performance and Results Act](#)

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

- h. [Executive Order 13279, Equal Protection of the Laws for Faith-Based and Community Organizations](#)
- i. [Executive Order 13280, Responsibilities of the Department of Agriculture and the Agency for International Development With Respect to Faith-Based and Community Initiatives](#)
- j. [OMB Circular A-11, Preparation, Submission, and Execution of the Budget](#)
- k. [USAID Acquisition Regulation \(AIDAR\)](#)

**201.4.2 Internal Mandatory References**

Effective Date: 06/01/2012

- a. [201mah, Guidance on the Implementation of the Counter Trafficking in Persons \(C-TIP\) Code of Conduct](#)
- b. [201mai, Policy Guidance for DOD Overseas Humanitarian Assistance Program \(HAP\)](#)
- c. [201mal, Strengthening USAID's Gender Programming and Organizational Structure](#)
- d. [201map, Counter-Trafficking in Persons and Contractor/Recipient Compliance: Agency-Wide Standard Operating Procedure](#)
- e. [ADS 302, USAID Direct Contracting](#)
- f. [ADS 303, Grants and Cooperative Agreements to Non-Government Organizations](#)
- g. [ADS 304, Selecting the Appropriate Acquisition and Assistance \(A&A\) Implementation Instrument](#)
- h. [ADS 305, Host Country Contracts](#)
- i. [ADS 306, Interagency Agreements](#)
- j. [ADS 308, Grants and Cooperative Agreements with Public International Organizations](#)

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

- k. [Acquisition and Assistance Policy Directive 04-16, Public-Private Alliance Guidelines & Collaboration Agreement](#)
- l. [Cash Transfers and Interest Earnings \[94 State 205189\]](#)
- m. [A Collaborative Approach to Reviewing HIV/AIDS Strategies](#)
- n. [ESF Cash Transfer Assistance – Amplified Policy Guidance \[87 State 325792\]](#)
- o. [Financial Management Guidance on Dollar Separate Accounts for ESF Cash Transfers and ESF-, DA and DFA-Funded Non-Project Sector Assistance Cash Disbursements \[90 State 194322\]](#)
- p. [Guidance on the Definition and Use of the Child Survival and Health Program Funds](#)
- q. [Guidance on the Definition and Use of the Child Survival and Health Program Funds \[and Appendices\]](#)
- r. [Human and Institutional Capacity Development Policy Paper](#)
- s. [Policy Guidance on Criteria for Payment of Salary Supplements for Host Government Employees \[88 State 119780\]](#)
- t. [Post-Crisis Planning and Implementation—USAID Policies and Regulations](#)
- u. [Program Assistance](#)
- v. [Supplemental Guidance on Programming and Managing Host Country-Owned Local Currency \[91 State 204855\]](#)
- w. [USAID – U.S. PVO Partnership Policy Guidance](#)
- x. [USAID Assistance to Internally Displaced Persons Policy](#)
- y. [USAID Assistance to Internally Displaced Persons Policy – Implementation Guidelines](#)

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

- z. [USAID Political Party Assistance Policy](#)
- aa. [Technical Analyses for Long-Term Planning](#)
- ab. [Agricultural Sector Assessments](#)
- ac. [A Practical Framework: Ten Steps for Analyzing and Integrating Public-Private Alliances Into USAID Strategic Planning](#)
- ad. [List of Assistance Implementing Mechanisms](#)
- ae. [Conducting a DG Assessment: A Framework for Strategy Development](#)
- af. [Economic Analysis of Assistance Activities](#)
- ag. [Education Sector Assessment \[Volume 5: Strategy Development and Project Design\]](#)
- ah. [Field Operations Guide for Disaster Assessment and Response](#)
- ai. [Fiscal Year USAID Statutory Checklists \(Template for Country Checklist and Activity Checklist\)](#)
- aj. [Guidance for Preparation of Background Assessments on Biological Diversity and Tropical Forests for Use in CDSS or Other Country Plans](#)
- ak. [Guidance from the Office of the Global AIDS Coordinator \(multiple documents\)](#)
- al. [Guide To Gender Integration and Analysis](#)
- am. [Guidelines for Financial Analysis of Activities](#)
- an. [Illustrative Gender Scopes of Work](#)
- ao. [Institutional Development](#)
- ap. [Introduction to Food Security Analysis](#)

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*



- aq. [Legal and Policy Considerations when Involving Partners and Customers on Strategic Objective Teams and Other Consultations](#)
- ar. [Mitigation Practitioner's Handbook](#)
- as. [Model Checklist for Pre-Obligation Requirements](#)
- at. [OFDA Guidelines for Grant Proposals and Reporting](#)
- au. [OFDA Guidelines for Unsolicited Proposals and Reporting](#)
- av. [PD #6, Environmental and Natural Resources Aspects of Development Assistance](#)
- aw. [Population Assistance](#)
- ax. [PPC Summary Description of FAA sections 118\(e\) and 119\(d\) Requirements for Preparing Strategic Plans](#)
- ay. [Social Soundness Analysis](#)
- az. [Tips for Conducting a Gender Analysis at the Activity Level](#)
- bb. [Tools for Alliance Builders](#)
- bc. [USAID Gender Integration Matrix](#)
- bd. [U.S. Five Year Global HIV/AIDS Strategy](#)

**201.5        ADDITIONAL HELP**  
Effective date: 01/17/2012

Due to the interrelated nature of ADS chapters 200-203, please also consult the comprehensive list of documents in [ADS 200.5](#).

- a. [Development Experience Clearinghouse](#)

**201.6        DEFINITIONS**  
Effective date: 01/17/2012

See comprehensive list contained in [ADS 200.6](#).

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*

201\_032312

*\*An asterisk and yellow highlight indicate that the adjacent material is new for this chapter or substantively revised.*